THE
MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke*

No. 2 JANUARY 1961 New Series Vol. IV

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

Trailing a Cope

The Archbishop of York, preaching in St. Mary's Cathedral, Edinburgh, during Scotland's celebration of the fourth centenary of her Reformation, departed, we venture to believe, from that balanced yet forceful approach to Church politics that we have come to expect from him. The root of his sermon was one to be repeatedly unearthed in these days: the ultimate impulse of a living Church is not to be found in any one period of its past. Would that he had held this note. Unhappily, he contrasted the Scottish and English Reformations to the great advantage of the latter, and went on:

> The prayer of Christ for unity, faith, holiness, continues. Where did we look for the basis of our answer? Not to the sixteenth or seventeenth centuries, grateful though we were for good things which then happened, both in Scotland and in England. We looked to gifts of God which were not Scottish or English, national or denominational, but truly Catholic, given by God to his Church in early days for its unity, continuity and witness to apostolic truth. In appealing to Scripture as the supreme authority in doctrine, we appealed also to Creed, episcopate, Sacraments, to the whole treasure of antiquity. The Scottish Episcopalians made that appeal, and we of the Anglican Communion everywhere stand with them.

Do we, on episcopacy in such a context and with the significance lent to the word by this occasion of its utterance and by the breakdown of our Conversations with the Presbyterians? It would be wiser and more hopeful, in this and other aspects, to distinguish between the Catholic substance of Church Order and the local forms of its exercise. In the report on these Conversations (p. 11) both sides fully acknowledged that *episcopé,* with its fundamental pastoral import, was exercised through

the Presbytery, the minister, and the elders. Has not the time come to recognise again, as does Article XXXIV of our own Reformation, that given concord in the essentials of Faith, from which true Order must stem, then variety in 'particular and national' forms of Order is to be expected and accepted? To make progress towards Christian unity dependent on success in papering over this variety with some formula is wrong-headed and futile. Secondary differences in Order as between the Churches spring deeply from the diverse political, social and cultural histories of their peoples. The Scottish Kirk has no more room for Bishops as we understand them to be than have our Parochial Church Councils for elders as Scotland uses them. For that matter, the Life and Liberty Movement took into the English Church what was digestible of Presbyterianism in creating our Parochial Councils of laymen; whilst Scotland has grown strongly in the pastoral ministry of the ordained, as she has in sacramentalism, since those days. What then now hinders intercommunion at least, as the Archbishop of Canterbury connotes that word? It would be as out of character for a Presbytery to flaunt lawn sleeves as for the English Bishops to carry the kilt.

The Queen voiced, with grace and brevity, the agreement of most church people on both sides of the border when she addressed the General Assembly of the Kirk.

> What meaning are we to give today to the establishment of the Reformed faith in Scotland in 1560? In spite of the bitter quarrels of the past, and the divided religious loyalties which still remain with us, I believe that what happened at the Reformation can be stated in terms on which all Christians may agree.
>
> Holy Writ was liberated to the people, and as a result the Word of God was revealed again as a force to be reckoned with in the affairs of both public and private life. The gospel, which had long been revered as a record handed down from primitive Christianity, was once more seen to be also a living light by which men ought to direct their lives, and perhaps remould their institutions.

A Canterbury Pilgrim

The Primate's visit to Rome stirred Modern Churchmen to respectful praise, as it did nearly all men. It remained for the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Westminster to strike the jarring note.

> From our knowledge of the Holy See and of successive Pontiffs, we are sure that the Holy Father would receive the Archbishop with the same sympathetic cordiality as he and his predecessors have extended to many other religious leaders.

Such adolescent *faroucherie* only strengthens approval of the Primate's journey. We have no illusions about the Rome we have known. Dr.

Fisher has had the courageous common-sense of the diplomatist's basic adage: When further negotiation seems hopeless that is the time to begin negotiations afresh. We can be soberly satisfied that the Pope should have responded in a like mood.

A New Departure?

The Primate, in the first of his three itinerant sermons, that preached in Jerusalem, did more than contribute notably to the present trend towards unity. He quickened it in a new and most hopeful direction, in part by a cardinal restatement of the nature of the goal.

> Need we be surprised if within the unity of the Church as the body of Christ there continue to be distinct and particular Churches with their own domestic life? That has always been so in the east and there is no reason to suppose that on earth these distinctions should ever disappear. —The full unity of the faith, the full unity of the Son of God, the full mature manhood, the full stature of the one Church is far in the future, perhaps never to be attained, according to the fullness of Christ by the Church militant here on earth. Bodily growth comes as each part, each Church, does its own distinctive work faithfully and so helps to build up the whole body in love.

This Jerusalem Sermon may come to rank with the Archbishop's Cambridge Sermon and, we believe, is sprung from a bolder and wider vision. He underlined his meaning at Istanbul, where he distinguished, quite sharply, between distant union and unity now 'in the Fellowship of the Holy Spirit'; whilst at Rome, calling in the full power of the New Testament Faith to uphold his understanding of Order, he went on:

> I say deliberately 'unity', not union. For Church union or reunion rests upon reconciliation of jurisdiction and authorities so that within the Catholic Church the particular Churches of Christendom may be as formerly authorised in terms of co-ordination and full communion. But unity is of the spirit, and into that unity of discipleship and mutual love the Churches can enter already and are entering now.

. . . Or Marking Time at the Double?

But unless the Archbishop and all of us will, without procrastination, put the unity into tangible practice, the Holy Spirit will have been blasphemously invoked to bolster up lip-service to an ideal politically too dangerous to act upon yet inconvenient to drop. The time is short, as always. Mr. Pearce, a theological student, speaking to the British Council of Churches on the European Oecumenical Youth Assembly, said that a recent meeting at Lausanne 'was attended by 320 British delegates whose average age was 23 [and] it was a shock to many of them when they

found that they were unable to take Holy Communion together'. The report of the Council's Youth Department described this as 'a bitter experience', while its Chairman called for 'something to be done quickly'. The Archbishop assured the young people that 'some of us older people' had been wrestling with the problem of intercommunion all their lives:

> The Churches had in fact been taking the question seriously for a great number of years. It was inseparable from the question of unity. The two must go together.

The difficulties of the Archbishop in such a situation are not to be underrated, but this was to proffer stale husks to young men and women who had pleaded for only a handful of grain, and are precociously grown too weary and wary to look for a fatted calf. The statesman on occasion will act in a manner that the politician must deplore as irresponsible. If the Archbishop, returned from the Holy Places, will now give a daring lead and set about building a New Jerusalem in his own land, the response that his recent pilgrimage evoked should assure him that he will have overwhelming support from the vast majority of the British people.

This Side of the Moon

It was time that voices of moral authority in the Church had expressed the view normal to Christendom on the questions posed by unilateralism, which is pacifism in modern dress. Any materialist who doubted the power of belief, right or wrong, even in undogmatic England, must have changed his mind on seeing the explosive force of a belief all but wreck the Labour Party, and with it representative government as that has developed amongst us. The Dean of St. Paul's, in the course of a sermon that should be widely studied, made a fresh contribution to the debate characteristic of the strong pragmatic strain in English morality. As his predecessor used to ask, what would the Good Samaritan have done had he arrived whilst the thugs were at work?

> I have heard it said that a Communist take-over at least would secure peace for us. That, I believe, is a complete delusion. For a time, perhaps, there would be a stunned external peace, but how long would it last? Look at the history of this country and its people. How long would they endure the dictatorship which would be imposed? Would they ever, even after years of conditioning, cease to be the turbulent and stubborn lovers of personal freedom, claiming the right to say what they think, that they have been in the past? I don't believe it. The take-over would not be the end of war; it would be the beginning of a war which might last for centuries, waged under every disadvantage, waged alone, without allies.

We must do nothing which would weaken the balance or injure our alliance with those who agree with us on the kind of world which would be in accordance with our Christian belief in the dignity of human personality and the freedom of the individual.

Out-establishing the Establishment

Another such rare voice was that of the Archdeacon of London. Lovers of liberty must be grateful to the *Sunday Times* for drawing attention to the conduct of the Independent Television Authority in banning the Archdeacon's second and third Epilogues, which charitably criticised unilateralism on Christian grounds, and for publishing them in full. This behaviour of the Authority is as inexplicable as it is unjustified. The tendency of commercial television to hand out religious pabulum is usually put down to its anxiety not to disturb the cow-like receptivity of the viewer lest, awake, he resists the subliminal persuasions of the advertisers. But in this case we believe that the Company concerned backed the televising of the Epilogues and was over-ruled by the Authority itself. The Authority has indeed said that it received many complaints from pacifists after the first Epilogue. We are come to a pretty pass, horribly familiar in spheres secular and sacred abroad, when a minority can claim not only to be heard, as it should be, but to be alone heard. We trust that the Pilkington Committee, now considering the future of broadcasting, will take account of such pusillanimous behaviour, in this instance and in the matter of the *Daily Worker*. It should hesitate long before extending the range of this curiously named Independent Authority, by contrast with which the B.B.C. is a veritable Grandmother Courage.

'Hark the Brave Music . . .'

It is sad that no pacifist nor any other of the usually clamant bodies has so far protested against this ban in the name of our civil liberties. It cannot be six miles from the headquarters of Christian Action to the offices of the I.T.A.: it is over 6,000 to South Africa. There is a well-known law to be discerned here: the force of a moral indignation increases with the square of the distance of the moralist from the scene of the cause of his indignation.

DEAN INGE

By P. Gardner-Smith, B.D.
Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge

It was time that a life of William Ralph Inge should be written, despite the great Dean's solemn prohibition, and Canon Adam Fox is to be congratulated on having produced the present volume.[1] It must have been an exacting task, for the life of a scholar-ecclesiastic provides few incidents to furnish material for a biographer, and, on the other hand, Inge's literary output was so great that the labour of reading even a representative selection of his works might well have daunted any author who sought to discover how this quiet scholar became the best-known and most influential clergyman in the Church of England. It is clear that Canon Fox has not shirked his labours. He gives a list of nearly a hundred publications—books, essays, printed sermons, introductions; but this does not include most of Inge's innumerable newspaper articles, letters to the press, unpublished sermons, and, above all, the full diary that he kept for more than sixty years.

Son of the Reverend William Inge, cricket blue, Fellow of Worcester, curate of Crayke in Yorkshire, and later Provost of Worcester, the future Dean received his early education from his parents, both of whom were well qualified to teach. Canon Fox draws an attractive picture of life in a clerical home in the mid-Victorian era, culture and piety being blended to form a perfect pattern. In 1874 Inge won the second scholarship at Eton and became the pupil of Francis St. John Thackeray, under whose care he developed rapidly as a classic of outstanding ability. Admitted to King's College in 1879, he began his career of dazzling successes, culminating in the first Chancellor's medal in 1883. He was not immediately elected into a Fellowship, being beaten in the competition by his friend Dimsdale, but he was elected in 1886, the first of the four successful candidates: by then he had taken up schoolmastering, and he never resided. After temporary appointments at Aldenham, Harrow, and Winchester, he returned to Eton. He had most of the gifts, but not that of teaching schoolboys; and although he felt deeply the final break with the school he loved, he was certainly right to accept the offer of a classical lectureship at Hertford College, Oxford, in 1889.

The next fifteen years were formative in Inge's life. He began as the ordinary classical don, correcting compositions, lecturing on Greek and Latin literature, and taking his part in college affairs. As always, he was a hard worker, lecturing four times a week and some terms every day. But this did not occupy all his time, for besides playing games (cricket,

[1] *Dean Inge*, by Adam Fox. (J. Murray, 28/-.)

tennis, lawn tennis, croquet, whist, billiards, in most of which he excelled) he read widely and thought deeply. In 1892 he took priest's orders, and he played his part in the religious life of the college. Of his theological views at this early period there is not much evidence. He was not happy in Tractarianism, so dear to his mother, and he was repelled by the uncritical bibliolatry of most of the Evangelicals; so he waited and thought. Surprisingly for a scholar of his eminence, he lost interest in the classics. In the words of Canon Fox, 'his thinking changed from philology to philosophy. His writing changed from school books to Bampton Lectures and the like. At the same time his academic repute changed to public recognition'. Stimulated by his colleague Rashdall he resolved as early as 1891 'to abandon minute classical research and to run myself as a teacher and preacher, the goal a headmastership or high office in the Church'. Before long (1894) he was writing, 'I mean to resume my studies in second and third century literature and history—for a book or Bamptons.' He was some time in finding a subject that seemed worth pursuing, though early in 1895 he wrote in his diary, 'I must read Plotinus some time.' He did indeed, but for the present he was attracted to Christian mysticism, and he got down to serious research. The result was the Bampton Lectures of 1899 by which his reputation was established. He now won wider recognition, lecturing to senior audiences at Oxford and in London, and, at the invitation of Hensley Henson, delivering a Lenten course at St. Margaret's, Westminster. Henson advised him to devote himself entirely to theology and thought he might exercise a real influence. It was wise advice.

If Inge's interest in mysticism originated in a desire to find something to write about, it soon became for him far more than a mere academic study. None of the parties in the Church satisfied him, and although he was impressed by Gore, and investigated Christian Socialism, the only result was to make him a lifelong opponent of socialism in every form. In mysticism he found an opportunity of giving scope and expression to his deep personal religious feeling without standing committed to any detailed dogmatic system. Henceforth he sought to promote religion as the inward life of the soul, ever seeking union with God, but detached from slavish obedience to doubtful elaborations. Such mysticism promised peace, for 'the saints do not quarrel'. But ecclesiastics do, and he was by no means popular in Church circles. His theology seemed vague and unsatisfying, and his epigrams went home. In Oxford the question was freely debated, 'Is Inge a Christian?' Years afterwards Rashdall called him a Buddhist, and Bernard Shaw said he was a Quaker.

In 1904 Henson persuaded him to accept the living of All Saints, Ennismore Gardens, and Inge found himself faced with the unfamiliar duties of a parish priest. The move, coinciding with his marriage to Miss Mary Catharine Spooner, marks the turning-point of his life, for he now

emerged from the academic society of Oxford into the wider life of London. The parish was not large, but he soon had a big congregation of cultured people. He published *All Saints Sermons* when he left. Helped in all things by his devoted wife, Inge expanded to become something of a social lion, much in demand as a diner out, an after-dinner speaker, and an oracle who always had something interesting to say. How much he owed to his beloved 'Kitty' Canon Fox's biography makes clear. She was exactly the right wife for him. No blue-stocking, and never competing with her husband in the intellectual sphere, Mrs. Inge was an ideal companion, admiring him, making him comfortable, introducing him to a wide circle of acquaintances, acting as a willing and charming hostess, and, above all, sharing in the loving care of their five children. It is significant that the fits of depression from which he suffered in his earlier years ceased almost entirely with his marriage. In 1899 we find him wishing he was dead; thirty-five years later, when a lady wrote to ask him whether he thought life worth living, he replied, 'That depends on the state of your liver.'

He had been less than three years at All Saints when he was elected Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, being admitted on 1 October 1907 and immediately elected to a professorial Fellowship at Jesus College. He held the chair for only four years, and no doubt for that reason Canon Fox devotes only sixteen pages to what he regards as an interlude; but those who knew Inge in his Cambridge days would have been glad of more. Inge had not yet become a national figure, but he was a very considerable person in the University. He himself remarked long afterwards that he was then at the height of his powers. His literary output was still small—*Faith and its Psychology* (1909), *Speculum Animae* (1911)—but he was lecturing and preaching in London and elsewhere, building up his reputation, and hard at work on his study of Plotinus. He interested himself in the current Education controversy, concerning which his views were at variance with those of most ecclesiastics. Foakes Jackson remarked that 'Inge would solve the Education problem by having every child taught the four gospels and the works of Plotinus'. He was happy at Jesus College, where he found 'a very friendly society'. He preached regularly in chapel, and he attended college meetings. There he would sit silent and apparently preoccupied through some long debate, until at last he would intervene, sum up the points in a few incisive words, and there was no more to be said. One of his colleagues, William Welsh, Senior Wrangler and Tutor of the College, remarked, 'Inge is the cleverest man I have ever known.'

As professor Inge was not brought much into contact with the undergraduates, and he tells us that he held the intellectual standards of most of the theologians in low esteem, much below those of his classical honours men at Hertford; but his lectures on the Philosophy of Religion, the

Fourth Gospel, and St. Paul, were well attended, and his audience appreciated his epigrams even when they were puzzled by his theology. A select few were invited to his home at Brook House, where he held a kind of seminar, and fewer still were privileged to receive the professor's comments on their essays. He even maintained the old custom of inviting his pupils to go for walks with him, and at least one will not forget hurrying along the Trumpington Road beside the silent sage. He would walk fast, jerking his elbows nervously, and occasionally giving utterance to some striking comment on the questions of the day. It was all rather embarrassing, but tension was relaxed at the ample tea that followed, for then the real Inge was revealed, full of wit and wisdom. His remarks could be devastating. When Winnington Ingram had just preached to a vast congregation at Great St. Mary's Inge's comment was 'I cannot understand the attraction of the Bishop of London: every time I hear him he seems to me more and more egotistical and more and more platitudinarian.' It is pleasant to reflect that in later years he came to know the Bishop better, and though he had little sympathy with his views, and lamented his policy, their relations were friendly. Two men less alike could hardly be imagined, and Inge supported a scheme for an exchange of sees by the bishops of London and Gloucester. Winnington Ingram was unco-operative, and it is by no means certain that the Dean of St. Paul's would have got on any better with his friend Arthur Headlam. There was an occasion when Headlam protested against what he regarded as the excessive asperity of Inge's contribution to some newspaper correspondence, only to provoke the rejoinder 'It is a startling experience to be instructed in the amenities of controversy by the Bishop of Gloucester.'

In his Cambridge days Inge did not hide his dislike of Anglo-Catholicism, which he regarded as superstitious and obscurantist, exalting the trivialities of religion at the expense of the greater truths. Asked whether he was interested in Liturgiology, he replied, 'No, and I don't collect postage stamps'. When he heard that 'What Canon X does not know about the subject is not worth knowing', his inevitable rejoinder was 'Perhaps the same might be said of what he does.' Inge and Gwatkin promoted a society 'For the Study of English Church Doctrine', one object of which was to counteract the activities of the high church S.T.C., at that time influential among the undergraduates. Attended by two such giants the meetings were stimulating, and Inge was at his best at such informal gatherings. One evening a distinguished visitor spoke on the theory of punishment, propounding the enlightened view that punishment is only justified when its sole aim is the reformation of the offender. Subsequent speakers vied with one-another in giving expression to their liberal views. Then came a voice from the front row, 'If I were to see a man torturing a child or an animal I know what I should wish to do to him, and the last thought in my mind would be the good of the offender'. The discussion waned.

It was at this time that Inge began his sustained attack on the Roman Catholic Modernists. 'Belief, if genuine, is honest; unbelief, when it is sincere, is respectable; modernism, which is make-believe, is neither honest nor respectable.' Some have wondered why he was so much opposed to views that did not seem to differ greatly from those he himself came to hold. The explanation is not difficult. Apart from his dislike of the Roman Church as a world-wide political organization, the pale ghost of the Caesars, sitting enthroned upon the seven hills of Rome, he was offended by the attempt of Loisy and Tyrrell to distinguish between truths of fact and truths of faith. He was a consistent rationalist, never wavering in his opposition to that flight from reason which he detected in many modern theological movements. The modernists started from a position of extreme historical scepticism, 'and then, when the whole edifice of historical religion seems to have been overthrown, they turn round suddenly and say that all their critical labours mean nothing for faith, and that we may go on repeating the old formulas as if nothing had happened. . . . Our contemporaries believe that matters of fact are important, and they insist, with ever-increasing emphasis, that they shall not be called upon to believe, as part of their religious faith, anything which, as a matter of fact, is not true.' English modernism he could respect because he thought it preserved its intellectual integrity and did not seek to restore with one hand what it had taken away with the other. It was congenial to his own undogmatic faith. What he could not tolerate was the attempt to maintain a rigidly dogmatic system while admitting that its foundations had been destroyed. In his later years Inge gave active support to the Modern Churchmen's Union, and served as its President from 1924 to 1934 because he regarded it as championing the cause of freedom; but he never committed himself to the historical scepticism which sometimes goes under the name of modernism. In 1910 he warned one of his pupils aganst the Churchmen's Union, 'That's the society in which you are whipped fore someone else's heresies.'

By instinct Inge was a conservative in theology. Biblical criticism was never his primary interest, though he accepted its results while 'declining to surrender nearly all that M. Loisy has surrendered'. He never doubted that Christianity must have a historical foundation, and maintained that 'faith and knowledge must be confronted with each other till they have made up their quarrel. The crisis of faith cannot be dealt with by establishing a *modus vivendi* between scepticism and superstition. That is all that Modernism offers us; and it will not do.' When Schweitzer's views were winning wide acceptance at Cambridge he discussed them with his lecture class, confessing that his mind had been much disturbed by what he regarded as an attack on the foundations of historical Christianity. So he read the gospels right through again, and decided that one side of the evidence had been much exaggerated. 'I cannot believe that the Founder

of the Christian religion was a deluded dreamer. We all know the thorough-going apocalyptist, and we put him in a lunatic asylum.' Ten or twelve years later he was a good deal shocked by Foakes Jackson's and Lake's *Beginnings of Christianity*. When told of Foakes Jackson's assurance 'It will be all right; Lake guarantees the learning, and I the orthodoxy', Inge replied 'I don't think Foakes Jackson has fulfilled his function'. His attitude towards extreme scepticism did not change. When a quarter of a century later Bishop Barnes published his book on the Rise of Christianity Inge declined to review it. 'Barnes is a friend of mine; if I were to review his book he would be a friend no longer.'

Yet he used the Bible with discrimination and had no sympathy with bibliolatry. He thought much of the Old Testament irrelevant to Christian faith, and he deplored the excessive place given in our church services to 'the childish legends of a semi-barbarous semitic people'. He felt the danger of basing religion too much upon the supposed events of a distant past. In 1922 he wrote 'Miracles must be relegated to the sphere of pious opinion. It can never again be possible to make the truths of religion depend on physical portents having taken place as recorded. The Christian religion can stand without them, and the rulers of the Church will soon have to recognize that in very many minds it does stand without them.' As to the distinction sometimes drawn between the natural and the supernatural orders he declared at a Cambridge gathering 'I must confess that the word "supernatural" is to me like a red rag to a bull. Stories of axes' heads floating on water and pumpkins being turned into coaches and horses afford me no spiritual consolation.' In mysticism Inge 'found peace', and in that assurance he concluded that 'Christianity is unassailable unless betrayed by its apologists'. Canon Fox quotes from *Outspoken Essays*, 'Formless and vague and fleeting as it is, the mystical experience is the bedrock of religious faith'. A noble conviction, but not easy to explain to the average congregation.

Established at St. Paul's the new Dean continued with increasing freedom to give expression to his deepest convictions and to apply his mind to the problems of modern life. The year after his appointment he delivered at Sion College the addresses on *The Church and the Age* which earned for him the sobriquet of 'The Gloomy Dean'. He greatly resented it, protesting that no Christian can be a pessimist, since Christianity is a system of radical optimism. But the name stuck and became a title of affection. When his writings are considered as a whole it may not appear altogether inappropriate, for he had an unquestionable tendency to look on the dark side of things. In both world wars he was convinced that this country would be defeated, and if Churchill thought otherwise he was 'not telling the truth'. Some features of modern life seemed to him altogether deplorable, and he was depressed by the progress of movements which he thought could only bring disaster. Democracy, for instance,

meant for him the rule of the demos, the rabble, and even in Cambridge days he had called it 'the doctrine of the divine right of kings standing on its head'. At the best it implied 'faith in the plenary inspiration of the odd man'. The increasing power of the working classes seemed to him to threaten the quality of life, for they would destroy that which they could neither understand nor appreciate. Inge was an aristocrat in the strictest sense of the term, convinced that only the best people are fit to rule. Socialism he regarded as 'purely predatory', and he found it hard to believe in the disinterested sincerity of its advocates. In particular he distrusted those of the clergy who showed sympathy with left-wing politics, calling them 'the self-oppointed chaplains of King Demos'. It must be remembered that Inge had very little experience of the working classes and very little knowledge of their difficulties, so he judged them by the agitators who too often represent them in the press and elsewhere. Had he known them better he might have feared them less. He admitted that the British working man is generally a very good fellow, and he was deeply touched when so many stood silent and bare-headed while the funeral of his little daughter passed down Ludgate Hill.

Inge held the Deanery of St. Paul's for 23 years,—years of astonishing activity. His first duty was to the Cathedral, and he did not neglect it. He was not always happy in the Chapter, for among the Canons he found few kindred souls, and the Dean of St. Paul's has little freedom. Attendance at the long and elaborate musical services ('serenading the Almighty') he thought a sad waste of time, and during the anthems which bored him and the sermons which he could not hear he generally read a book, as often as not a volume of Plato. Canon Fox passes lightly over the great work of restoring the dome of St. Paul's in which the Dean was deeply involved and to which he attributed the survival of the Cathedral in the second war. The King and Queen were present at the reopening service on 25 June 1930, and two days later Inge was made K.C.V.O.

During the whole period of his deanship Inge was intensely active, lecturing to distinguished audiences, preaching to crowded congregations, and publishing books. *Plotinus* appeared in 1918, the fruit of 20 years' work. *Outspoken Essays* (2 volumes, 1919 and 1922) added greatly to his fame and convinced the editors of the evening papers that here was a writer who would command the attention of their readers. Inge began his journalism in 1919 and almost to the end of his life he wrote regularly for the press, supplying readable and often striking columns on a great variety of subjects. The work brought him not only fame but fortune, for the papers offered 20, 30 and even 40 guineas for his short articles. Inevitably he was criticised both by those whose views he attacked so pungently, and by less successful journalists who resented his incursion into their professional field. He himself was not quite happy about it and wrote in his diary 'I think there is some loss of dignity in my acting as a journalist

for a not very high class paper if I can do without it. On the other hand, to give up £2,000 a year for half a day's work a week is to surrender a good deal.' He did give it up in 1930, but only for a time. There are still those who blame Inge for 'ceasing to be a pillar of the church to become two columns in the *Evening Standard*'. But there is something to be said on the other side. Even though he was by no means indifferent to what he called 'the heavy bribes' offered by the editors, he never doubted that he had a message, and by expressing it in popular form he reached hundreds of thousands who could never have heard his sermons or read his books. An Oxford professor recalls how as a boy he would rush out of school on Wednesday afternoon to buy the *Evening Standard* and read with avidity the Dean's latest pronouncement. Canon Fox quotes from an anonymous article that appeared when some outburst of Inge's had got him into trouble:

> 'The originality and sometimes the eccentricity of Dean Inge reaches hundreds of thousands of eager readers who are seldom seen in church. . . . It is a great asset to any generation to possess at least one man who says exactly what he believes concerning things in general, and for the moment we can only look for such a man in the Deanery of St. Paul's.'

How Inge got through so much work amid a continual round of exacting engagements may seem a mystery. Two facts explain it. In the first place, he was always a hard worker, and the powerful concentration of his intellect made him a very fast worker too. He knew exactly what he wanted to say, and long practice supplied the words. What is astonishing is that very late in life he confessed that he could work faster than in his younger days. Evidence supports this unusual experience, for when he was nearly 90 a publisher wrote to him asking for two considerable articles, and he got them within a week. In the second place, Inge limited his activities and never wasted his time. He used to denounce the mischievous habit of dreaming, and preached on the control of the thoughts. In smaller ways he economized. A visitor at the Deanery, coming down to breakfast, noted with awe the huge pile of letters beside the Dean's plate. He had no secretary, so it looked as though he would have a busy morning. But after breakfast he took a knife, slit open the envelopes one by one, glanced at the signatures, and put the whole pile into the waste paper basket. 'I get a great many letters from people I never heard of: some are impertinent, and some are abusive.' He must have read a few, for he recalled one from a lady who informed him that she was praying regularly for his death, adding that in several previous cases she had been most successful. It was an interesting privilege to stay at the Deanery. 'Nisi monumentum requiris circumspice' was Inge's warning to a preacher as he crossed the street to the Cathedral; and in answer to an enquiry as to

how one could best be heard in St. Paul's, 'You should address the statue of Sir Joshua Reynolds, and remember that he was slightly deaf.' But a visitor had to be careful. When one such presumed to fetch a plate that Inge needed from the sideboard the Dean's daughter remarked, 'You are a bold man to try to help father; last week someone picked up a newspaper he had dropped, and he flung it down on the floor.'

Inge left St. Paul's in 1934, feeling that he had done his work and that 'a minor prophet' should not stay when he had delivered his message. He wrote in his dairy 'It is odd that I don't feel more sentimental over the move. I think the fact is that I feel my innings is nearly over, and I am only walking back to the pavilion.' Of course it was a wrench, and he felt keenly the parting from so many friends; but he had never shared his wife's delight in London life, and once settled at Brightwell Manor he was very happy. At the end of 1934 he wrote 'I have not the slightest doubt that I did right.'

He was far from idle in retirement. Invitations poured in to write and lecture and preach. He enjoyed Oxford life. He visited friends and entertained them. He went on Hellenic cruises. He regularly visited his two colleges at Cambridge. Nor did he cease to write; in 1935 we find him 'getting on swimmingly' with articles for the *Evening Standard*, and though he relaxed for a time after leaving St. Paul's, he published nine considerable books between 1934 and 1949. He had two great sorrows. Richard, his youngest son, and the only one to take Holy Orders, was killed in 1941 when serving in the R.A.F.; and in 1949 Mrs. Inge, who had been in poor health for some years, died suddenly, and so ended an idyllic partnership of 45 years. Two sons and a daughter remained, and he wrote 'My dear children make life tolerable for me.' He was now very old and very deaf, and outside engagements grew few. Strangely enough, one of the last to be abandoned was the annual sermon he was accustomed to preach at Pusey House. In the *Modern Churchman* for March 1954 appeared the last article he wrote, 'Liberalism is not Dead'; but its author had died on 26 February. He was 93.

Canon Fox has indeed rendered a great service to the present generation in recording the work and thought of Dean Inge, for it is in danger of forgetting him. That his books are so cheap on the bookstalls is partly due to their number and partly to the topical flavour of much of his writing. Inge was intensely interested in the world about him, and the world has changed. But the temporary eclipse of a popular writer for a few years after his death is a common experience, and Inge is assured of a place in the history of the Church and Nation.

The Biography has many merits, but perhaps two criticisms may be allowed. Canon Fox hardly does justice to Inge as a master of English prose. He says 'his writing was everywhere most lucid, and that it could not be without craftsmanship. . . . The whole effect of his writing does

give a certain aesthetic pleasure to the reader, it is so neat and economical. But it is not beautiful writing, nor even ornamental.' Much depends on what is meant by 'beautiful writing', and no one could imagine the Dean trying to produce ornamental prose, except by quotation. If the object of writing is not to show off, but to express clear thinking in the clearest possible language, then Inge's style was masterly. His sentences were short and crisp, and he never used a long word if a short one would express his meaning. 'Make up your mind what you want to say', he wrote to his son Richard, 'and then put it into the simplest language you can; that is the secret of good style.' He practised what he preached, and his advice might well be given to every candidate for a university degree, and to a good many more. His amazing power of quotation filled his readers with astonishment. It was partly due to the vast scope of his own reading, partly to his phenomenal memory, and partly to his habit of noting and copying extracts from what he read. Canon Fox mentions his commonplace book which contained over 1,700 numbered extracts and suggests many years of labour. No wonder that when he retired he exclaimed 'Now at last I can read for pleasure.'

More serious is the second criticism, that the book fails to present any vivid portrait of the man, as though the author had not known the Dean very well. Inge was famous not only for his wisdom, but also for his wit, and of that not much shines through Canon Fox's pages. More use might have been made of the great fund of stories about Dean Inge, for most of them were true. He was a great scholar, a great thinker, and a great writer; but he was also a great personality, and the fact might have been made clearer by his biographer. That he had not more influence on Church policy was due to his aloofness from party allegiance, though it was just that which made him a power in the land. He kept his friends, but they were not exempt from criticism. Of Hensley Henson in 1927, 'The Bishop of Durham is preparing to turn his coat again'; and later, 'He ceased to be a thinker and so became a yes-man among the bishops'. 'I told Henson that if the Church had been disestablished he would never have been a bishop.' Nor would Inge ever have been Dean of St. Paul's. William Temple was one of the trustees of his will, but he classed him with 'the mischievous busybodies of the Life and Liberty movement', and he regarded his elevation to the Primacy as 'a disaster'.

In an epilogue Canon Fox illustrates the truth of Asquith's opinion of Inge, 'A strange isolated figure, with all the culture in the world, and a curiously developed gift of expression, but with kinks and twists both intellectual and temperamental.' Inge's was indeed a strange character, full of apparent contrasts. A mystic, he was deeply concerned with the affairs of this present world; an ascetic, he enjoyed some of the good things of this life; concerned for money, he made little use of the things that money can buy; humble, yet sometimes arrogant; gentle and capable

of deep affection, he was intolerant of criticism and in controversy scathing and sometimes rude. We may accept his biographer's concluding words, 'This great lover of truth, ever grappling with it and with himself, so tormented, so irritable, so gifted, so intelligent, so dutiful, so affectionate, so unexpected, so successful, and all the time some kind of saint.' A very good kind of saint, and let him who doubts it read 'Paula's Book', *Personal Religion and the Life of Devotion,* written at the request of the Bishop of London. As Dean Matthews said at the Memorial Service in St. Paul's, 'William Ralph Inge was a great man, a unique man. We shall not look upon his like again.'

REUNION IN ANCIENT ISRAEL

Studies in the Book of Deuteronomy

By J. N. Schofield, M.A., B.D.
Lecturer in Hebrew and Old Testament Studies in the University of Cambridge

Most scholars agree that the Deuteronomic school of writers played a conspicuous part in the formation of the Old Testament literature, and that its outlook mingles the interests of the northern and southern kingdoms and of priests and prophets. This mingling may spring from a primitive simplicity, before the division of the kingdom in Palestine, representing an early form of Israel's religion before the revolutionary teaching of the great prophets—Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Micah in the eighth century B.C., and Jeremiah and Ezekiel in the seventh century; or it may reflect a later simplicity, achieved after the deluge of the Babylonians had swept across the little country early in the sixth century. If we accept the earlier date, the book helped to form Israel's religion and transmit Mosaic traditions; if the later date, then it was a great attempt to reconstruct religion after the Babylonian devastation had destroyed vested interests and ancient prejudices which, then as now, would prevent such reconstruction. The aim of the book is thus either a united or a reunited religion attempting to hold together north and south, prophet and priest —its contents show that behind its constant address to 'All Israel' is a strong appeal for religious unity, a united Church of Israel as well as a united nation. To-day, when one of the major problems of the Church is its attitude to organic union, it is of value to study this early attempt to unite divergent religious traditions.

I. Religion as a Covenant.

The most important element in Deuteronomic religion is a covenant relationship between Israel and her God, Yahweh and his people. He is called a covenant God; the Ark is the Ark of the Covenant; Israel is a

holy people, chosen and loved by God, bound to him by covenant; he is their God and they are his holy, peculiar people. But the facts about this covenant are interesting; three stages in its development are recognised. The first was an oath sworn by God to the patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; the second was the covenant made between God and people, without any intermediaries, at Horeb, and known as the Decalogue; the third was another covenant at Horeb, at the same time, given by God to Moses but not told to the people until the end of the wanderings; they became party to it in the land of Moab when about to enter Palestine, and it had relevance in that land only.

All three of these stages are important in the present form of Deuteronomy. The patriarchal oath is mentioned seven times in the book and only eighteen times in the remainder of the Old Testament. The reason seems to be that as a prelude to unity Deuteronomy rewrote the history of Israel's religion. Comparison of Ezek. xi, 15, and xxxiii, 24, suggests that the saying 'One man was Abraham, and he inherited the land; we are many and the land is given us as an inheritance' was current in oral tradition in Palestine between 597 and 586 B.C. among the common people who were glad to be rid of the upper classes carried captive to Babylon. Ezekiel himself, a priest at Jerusalem, accepted a different tradition: 'Then shall they dwell in their own land which I gave to my servant Jacob' (xxviii, 25; xxxvii, 25). It seems probable that the Deuteronomic linking of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as joint recipients of God's oath was the first official recognition, which has been preserved, of the connection of these three men, whose names belonged to various sanctuaries in Palestine, with Yahweh; and that, in the interest of national union, it carried the history of the religion of the whole nation back beyond David, the founder of Jerusalem's temple, its ritual and priesthood, beyond Moses and the Exodus, which had been the starting point for the prophets, to the popular traditions of the common people throughout all Palestine. In the new history the covenant religion was thus traced to men whom local traditional stories connected with sanctuaries and pilgrim centres through the whole land, and whose form of religion existed before there was a division between north and south, prophet and priest.

A comparable move today might be to begin our discussions on reunion, not with divisions under the Tudors nor the early Roman invasion of religion in this island, but with the native traditions of the Celtic Church.

At Horeb, the first covenant given by God publicly to the whole people contained only the Decalogue (iv:10 ff; v:2 ff); this could not be more emphatically stated (v:22). All other requirements—the command to individuals to love God (vi:5), and ritual and social demands—formed part of the second covenant, given to Moses alone at Horeb, to be taught to the people at the end of the wanderings. This Deuteronomic arrange-

ment of the material into two distinct covenants indicates a compromise between prophet and priest. The date of the Decalogue in its present form in Deut. v is doubtful, but prophetic evidence appears to point to the sixth century B.C. Jeremiah's list of the nation's sins (vii : 5 ff) is nearer the Decalogue than Hosea's (iii : 1; iv : 1 f.) but sufficiently different from it to render hazardous an assertion that he was dependent on that form of the Decalogue. Ezekiel's list of sins (xxii) is much closer to the duodecalogue of Deut. xxvii than to the decalogue of Deut. v; Zechariah (v : 3) mentions stealing and false swearing as crimes in the nation's life, but his list of God's requirements (viii : 16 cf. vii : 9) differs from the Decalogue, and he too does not refer to this code which the Deuteronomist regarded as the essence of the relationship between God and Israel. If this Decalogue was produced at a northern sanctuary, such as Bethel or Shechem, during the Babylonian exile under the influence of fugitive followers of Jeremiah, and was not brought south to Jerusalem until the second temple was built in 516 B.C., all these facts, and the place of the Decalogue in Deuteronomy's scheme of religious unity, would be explained. In this scheme the sole content of God's covenant with the whole people was the Decalogue, and so the primary element in the new form of Israel's religion was moral and prophetic, not ritual and priestly. It required the imageless worship of one God, the setting apart of the seventh day as a holy day on which no work was done, but for which no ritual requirements were made, and five requirements in daily conduct. The Deuteronomic reformers claimed that, when the nation was a united people under Moses before the entry into Palestine, there were clear, simple, moral and religious laws that could be fulfilled by every individual Israelite in his own home without the need for priest or prophet. The ten words, which can fairly be described as a summary of prophetic teaching, are given as God's only requirements on the day when Israel became God's holy people.

But there was a second covenant containing priestly demands made at Horeb on the same day (v : 1) to Moses alone (iv : 14; v : 31). Repeatedly it is stated that these regulations were to come into force in 'the land whither ye go over to possess it' or 'when God shall give you rest from all your enemies round about so that ye dwell in safety' (12; 10). It is the covenant which the Lord commanded Moses to make with the children of Israel in the land of Moab, beside the covenant which he made with them in Horeb (xxix : 1). Even this second covenant is prefaced by a spiritual demand (vi : 4) frequently called 'the commandment' and expounded in Deut. vi-xi. The prophets would have welcomed this preface and would probably not have objected to any of the civil laws in the second covenant, but it is clear that Jeremiah, at least, did not believe that God demanded animal sacrifices: his repudiation of all sacrificial ritual was as complete as his denunciation of child sacrifice (vii : 21 f, 30 f). Emphatically he stated that neither was ordered by God at the Exodus from

Egypt. With great sarcasm he told the people to add their burnt offerings (wholly given to God) to their sacrifices (eaten in a communal meal) and have a good meat meal if that was what they wanted, for God had given no command concerning burnt offerings or sacrifices (cf. vi : 20). Jeremiah either did not know the laws in Exod. xx and xxxiv, or did not accept them as part of any covenant made by God with Israel; but the vehemence of his language suggests that a claim was being made that sacrifice was an essential part of worship (cf. viii : 8). A hint of this claim may perhaps be seen in Ezek. xx : 25 f. Jeremiah (vii : 30; xix : 5; xxxii : 35) and Deuteronomy (xii : 31), both denounced the contemporaneous practice of sacrificing children, so opposing the law in Exod. xxii : 29. Ezekiel, on the other hand, refers to such a law as from God to punish the people. Probably the Jerusalem priesthood, to which Ezekiel belonged, claimed divine origin for a code containing Exod. xxii : 29, but the code was neither sufficiently ancient nor revered to prevent Jeremiah publicly rejecting it. Deuteronomy might then be an attempt to reconcile prophet with priest: while denying, as emphatically as Jeremiah, both that God demanded child sacrifice and that sacrifices were commanded to the people at Horeb, the book accepted in principle the priestly claim that animal sacrifices were part of the second covenant to be observed in Palestine. Great concessions were made: priests accepted the statement that the sacrificial ritual was secondary, not practised until after the settlement in Palestine; prophets, who had regarded it as of heathen, Canaanite origin, accepted it as divinely ordered through Moses.

Perhaps we might compare the scheme with the concessions necessary if all Christians agreed that, although Jesus taught openly only the Gospel, yet priestly, or Catholic, traditions of worship and concepts of the Church were given by him to the Apostles to be communicated to the Church when it was formed after his death, or came through the guidance of his spirit.

II. The Place and Meaning of Worship.

There are also clear regulations as to the corporate and public acts in which the united religion was to be expressed. The primary law was that there was to be one central sanctuary only, chosen out of all the tribes (xii : 5 f), where alone the one God must be worshipped. There all offerings were to be taken, all religious feasts held (xii), and thither all males must go three times a year (xvi : 16).

This law of the single sanctuary has always interested scholars. Those who date Deuteronomy in the Mosaic age think it legislated for a small compact group round successive sanctuaries comparable to the Tabernacle in the wilderness; it is thought that in Palestine early Israel was organised like some Greek communities as a religious unit round a central shrine and that, even if Deuteronomy was written many centuries after

Moses, old laws of that amphictyonic period were re-used to reconstruct religion on that ancient model; the orthodox critical theory that the book was found in the Jerusalem temple in 621 B.C. (II Kgs. xxii) thinks it aimed at centralising worship at Jerusalem, but it cannot be too emphatically stated that there is not the slightest shred of evidence for this in Deuteronomy itself—though it reveals extensive knowledge of Palestine the location of the sanctuary is constantly referred to in the ambiguous phrase 'the place which the Lord thy God shall choose'; the temporary site was near Shechem (xxvii: 4-7), the permanent site had not been chosen. It is not clear whether the law of a single sanctuary was an innovation. The books of Samuel and Kings show that no tradition of a single shrine survived for long the conquest of Palestine; Hezekiah's attempt to centralise worship at Jerusalem (II Kgs. xviii: 22) was clearly regarded as an innovation, as was Josiah's similar reform; Jeremiah said that in Judah and Jerusalem there were as many altars as streets, he used the ambiguous phrase, seen also in Deuteronomy, in a reference to Shiloh (vii: 14) and in scathing words prophesied that God had rejected Jerusalem as he had Shiloh, and would destroy it in the same way. When Jerusalem was destroyed in 586 B.C. people would think the prophecy fulfilled and seek a new dwelling place for God's name; Shechem, possibly the first amphictyonic shrine, still important after 586 B.C. (Jer. xli: 5) might have been acceptable to all Israel for an initial covenant ceremony under Gedaliah; when Mizpah became his capital Bethel, the nearby holy place, became a religious centre during the exile (Zech. vii: 1-5) until clear revelation came from God.

The law of a single sanctuary and the destruction of all other places of public worship may have been part of the Deuteronomic reunion and reconstruction of religion in Palestine after 586 B.C., facilitated by the thorough Babylonian devastation of southern Palestine; and such a law would revolutionise religion. The destruction of local altars, high places, and sanctuaries removed public, corporate acts of worship from the daily or weekly life of the community, and the central sanctuary of necessity became a place of pilgrimage at set occasions or family events. A reunion scheme based on the destruction of all local sanctuaries in each county or diocese apart from one central place, would radically change the form of organised religion. External forms of public worship could be controlled for uniformity or comprehensiveness, and it would be necessary to develop family religion in the local community.

Deuteronomy assumes that the meaning and use of sacrificial terms will be understood, so probably no change was made in forms of worship or types of offerings; the change was in their frequency, amount, and religious meaning. Three times a year every male Israelite must appear at the sanctuary: for the spring feast of Passover and Unleavened Bread, the summer feast of Weeks, and the autumnal feast of Tabernacles; to

each feast he must bring his gifts, and probably the annual presentation of firstlings, firstfruit, and tithes coincided with these festivals; no other religious services were compulsory, lunar feasts are not mentioned and the Sabbath was a day of rest, not of religious services. A minimum requirement was made for offerings, but it was low compared with other codes —only the first unblemished male from each flock or herd was demanded, not every firstling that opened a womb—and for two feasts the offerings were freewill in proportion to the giver's ability. No ritual use was made of blood: at sacrifices it was drained into the ground at the altar, and even at the Passover the blood rite, essential to the regulations in Exodus, was ignored. Nowhere in the code is there a hint that blood had cleansing power, nor were sacrifices connected with sin, forgiveness, or atonement. Sacrifice was the expression of gratitude to God for all his gifts, teaching men to fear—or worship—the Lord, to love and remember him always. To sacrifice, to eat before the Lord, to rejoice with others in all good things from the Lord were synonymous terms.

The need for daily worship was met by stressing family religion in the home. The command to love God was to be written on the door-posts of the house (vi : 9) and worn on the person (vi : 8). The law must be continually talked about at home (vi : 7) and diligently taught to children (vi : 7; iv : 9, 25, 40) in the form of questions and answers (vi : 20-25), and the whole family must gather at the sanctuary every seven years for the renewal of the covenant (xxxi : 10 ff). Today one result of the development of institutional Christianity has been to put religion into Church buildings, and to break the unity of the family in worship; the Church-in-the-home has ceased to exist. Perhaps there is something to be said for the Deuteronomic scheme.

III. The Constitution of the Religious Assembly.

The Deuteronomic reformers had to face the problems of the ministry as carefully as those today who attempt to unite Christians into one organic Church. Closing all local shrines, stressing the family as the religious unit, would clearly affect the number, status, and function of persons regarded as specially set apart for full-time religious work. Of the two main groups named in Deuteronomy, prophets were not permanent religious officials, but raised up by God to declare his will (xviii); the test of a prophet—whether his prophecy was fulfilled—showed him as concerned with guidance for the present or immediate future (xviii : 22) rather than a member of a professional guild. In a united Church, place must be found for temporary guidance and leadership from spirit-filled members, with other safeguards than the death penalty allowed in Deuteronomy! (xiii)

There is ambiguity in the description of the other group, the priests. They were usually called 'the priests the Levites': all priests were Levites and all Levites priests, but Levites were also classed with strangers,

widows, and fatherless as guests at sacrificial feasts, recipients of the triennial tithe and as dependent poor. Some Levites sojourned in country towns (xii : 12, 18) holding private property or dues inherited from their fathers and saleable when they left the district (xviii : 8). Others lived permanently at the central sanctuary, performing priestly and legal duties (x : 8; xxxiii : 8-11; xvii : 8 ff). Local Levites were attached to families or small communities for social and religious functions (cf. Jud. xvii : 10), they must be invited to accompany the family to the annual feasts and, whenever they wished, they could leave their local parish, join the central sanctuary staff and take an equal share in all priests' dues and duties. Ezekiel distinguished between Zadokite Levites, as alone possessing the holiness to officiate in the inner temple courts, and other Levites who might assist them as 'inferior clergy'; Deuteronomy, more conciliatory and inclusive, treated all Levites as full and equal priests, wherever they lived and to whatever family they belonged.

In Christianity today there is no one family, like Levites, with exclusive, hereditary right to perform priestly functions; each denomination has its religious leaders and its peculiar theory of ordination, status, and function. A compromise similar to that in Deuteronomy would require that all be offered equal status and function, and that there be no claim to exclusive succession or special grace through particular ordination. We might picture some ministers with their families living together in the precincts of the central sanctuaries dependent on dues and offerings there, and others in the provinces supported as part of the family by the community in which they lived and whom they helped in family religion and social and judicial functions—the two groups being completely interchangeable. It must however be recognised that Deuteronomy laid great stress on the place of the father of the family as a religious leader. He was responsible for teaching the children at morning and evening prayers (vi : 7), he offered sacrifices, killed animals (xii : 15) and poured out the blood; he presented tithes (xiv : 22), and firstborn (xv : 19), and sacrificed the passover (xvi). Deuteronomy aimed to produce a holy people (vii : 6; xiv : 2; xxvi : 19) not a holy priesthood. Though the story of Korah's revolt (Num. xvi) shows that not all Israel always agreed that 'the whole congregation is holy' yet the Deuteronomic ideal did not completely perish (Isa. lxii : 12), and early Christians were addressed as a holy priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people (I Pet. ii : 5, 9), the holy brethren (I Thess. v : 27), but neither in Deuteronomy nor the New Testament did holiness rest on the people's merit but on God's love and choice (vii : 7; ix : 5; x : 14).

The Hebrew word in Deuteronomy corresponding to 'Church' is translated 'congregation' or 'assembly'; it is often used to describe the Israelite religious community constituted at Horeb (iv : 10; ix : 10; x : 4): its limits are defined in xxiii : 1-8, and within these limits all Israelites and their

household dependents were full members. Provision was made for a first initiation of the whole people into the new covenant and for the renewal of the covenant every seven years (v : 1; xxvi : 16; xxxi : 10). There was no separate initiation of children. As part of the family they were within the covenant until at a periodic renewal they took their place in their own right, accepting the obligations of membership.

The new start in Deuteronomy is comparable with that in the Gospels. There must be a law but it is within the reach of all (Deut. xxx : 11 ff) and the yoke is easy; the need is recognised for forms and rites in which to express and conserve spiritual movements. But neither was a painfully worked out compromise accepted without enthusiasm or conviction, carefully balanced on a tightrope between extremes; they were courageous, revolutionary attempts to lift religion on to a new level. In post-exilic Israel we can watch the new Deuteronomic wineskins hardening, but when they ceased to be pliable they were burst by a Judaism that survived the loss of land and temple, and by Christianity. The future of our reunion movements depends on courage fearlessly to discover essentials and ruthlessly jettison accidentals, however beloved—to prove all things and hold fast to that which is true.

COMPELLE INTRARE AND THE PLEA OF THE PAGANS

By N. Q. King, Professor of Divinity in the University of Legon, Ghana

The view that it is the duty of the state to control religion and to correct and coerce religious deviationists found classical expression in the Theodosian Code and in St. Augustine's letter to Vincentius the Rogatist.[1] In the ecclesiastical edicts of the Code this view is everywhere implicit. It is also possible to choose out almost at random statements which put it explicitly. Heterodoxy is a public crime, for an outrage against divine religion brings injury to all. The Emperor's power is from God and he must use it to coerce those who commit sacrilege by rebelling against God's officially recognized representatives, the Bishops of the Catholic Church. After all, the Commonwealth is more upheld by correct religious observances than by the fulfilment of office or by the sweat of labour. Jews, pagans and heretics do not seek the Author of the world and its

[1]Ep. xciii, Migne PL xxxiii 321ff. 'Compelle intrare' is the best known wording and is used in the Vulgate (Wordsworth and White's *editio minor ap.* Lk. xiv, 23). The Migne text (*para.* 5, *col.* 323) uses 'cogite intrare'. The writer thanks Professor Henry Chadwick for drawing his attention to the deeper issues raised by this letter. That scholar is not however responsible for the views expressed.

plenty aright. In fact they offend him. If by therapeutical laws the Emperor tries to recall them to sanity, they must themselves take the blame for such severity. The deity must be appeased, drastic measures must be taken for the insatiable honour of the Catholic religion.[2]

No one need be surprised that those who sat in the seat of Diocletian should think like this. What is amazing is how with hardly a murmur the Church accepted as its own the very imperial scourge from which it had just escaped. The imperial thinking remained basic as long as the Byzantine Empire stood or had imitators. It permeated the orthodox churches. In the West, thanks to the immediate success of coercion, it was woven into catholic thought by St. Augustine.

In his letter to Vincentius, Augustine shows clearly enough that he was too good a Christian to accept the principle of coercion easily and throughout it one feels he is falling over backwards to try to convince himself and so others. He says that at first he considered no one should be forced into the unity of Christ. The warfare should be in words, and victory by thought, lest we found ourselves with merely pretending catholics (*cap.* 17). He knew how easy it was to persecute out of hate and how difficult to correct with love (50), but he had to give in to the examples his colleagues adduced. His own home town was converted to catholicism under the threats of the laws (17). It was clear that the state action had not been fruitless (1). Many were glad to be delivered by it from the tyranny of custom, from the sloth of ignorance and parental example. Would we not be culpable if we tolerated people who had used violence and did nothing to intimidate them, or if we did not use force to confine even an enemy crazed by fever who was rushing towards a precipice or to awake a sleeping man who was in danger? (2) Was he indeed to regret the salvation of so many and dissuade his fellow Bishops from their paternal diligence? (1) Surely the use of a little force in things temporal is worth the eternal gain (2). Paul himself handed a man's flesh over to Satan so as to save his soul (7).

He next deals with the objection that the use of force is not really effective. He asks whether medicine is to be neglected because the pestilence of many is beyond cure. Moreover, instruction follows intimidation (3). He turns to the Bible to prove his thesis and indeed it is not difficult to prove that not everyone who spares is a friend and not everyone who uses violence an enemy (4). God himself used violent means with the patriarchs and Paul (5). Though Hagar and her son suffered greatly at

[2]There are excerpts from *Cod. Theod.* xvi:5, 40, by Honorius in 407; xvi:1, 2 and xvi:2, 25 by Theodosius in 380 at the beginning of systematic persecution; xvi:2, 16 by Constantius in 361. The last sentences are from *Novell. Theod.* iii of 438 which with delightful frankness sums up earlier thought—'. . . pianda est superni numinis veneranda maiestatis . . .', '. . . insatiabili catholicae religionis honore. . . .'

the command of Sarah, yet Paul says Isaac was persecuted by Ishmael.[3] From this we should rather understand that the catholic Church suffers persecution by the arrogance and impiety of the carnal people whom she tries to amend by temporal molestation and terrors. Whatever therefore the true and legitimate mother does is good discipline, love not hatred. When good and bad men do and suffer the same, it is not the deeds and the punishments but the causes which allow the discernment of the difference between the two (6). What one ought to consider when someone is coerced is not the coercion but the end towards which he is coerced. No one can be good unwillingly, but by fear of what he does not want to suffer a man can be made to lay aside the animosity which impedes him or the ignorance which keeps him from recognizing the truth (16).

St. Augustine's arguments for the use of state coercion against Christian deviationists apply equally to the use of force against pagans. He says explicitly that imperial edicts have saved many from idols (10, 26). Catholics and Donatists approved of the use of force against the pagans and no Christian voice was raised against it. The well-known plea of the pagan Symmachus is really only for the remnants of Roman paganism to be allowed to co-exist with Christianity. The old man's thinking does not reach fundamentals. The Roman observances were ancient, they had brought victory and good harvests. In any case it was inconceivable that so great a mystery should be approached by only one way.[4]

It is not amongst the Christians or the aristocratic western pagan leaders that one finds a worthy retort to the logic of the Roman thinking which makes coercion inevitable. We have to turn to two Hellenistic pagan philosophers. The arguments of Themistius in his *Oratio* V go deep. After Julian had bled to death in 363, the soldiers elected Jovian. Themistius, who had retained his position of honour even under Constantius and was to receive high promotion under Theodosius, came to give the new Emperor a consular address and to encourage him in the policy of government non-interference in matters religious which he had adopted soon after his accession. It was the same policy of not tipping the scale for which Ammian afterwards praised Valentinian I.[5]

Themistius adduces some good arguments likely to appeal to a practical administrator. Persecution by both sides has been more disastrous than war with the Persians (82). Coercion produces time-servers and turn-coats

[3]Para. 6 referring to Galatians iv, 21ff.

[4]Symmachus: *Relatio* iii. 'Consuetudinis amor magnus est' (5). 'Uno itinere non potest perveniri ad tam grande secretum.' Migne *PL* xvi: 1007ff. (Migne's is the only version available here in this heat. But it is probably the only complete Migne in equatorial and tropical Africa!)

[5]'Inter religionum diversitates medius stetit, nec quemquam inquietavit', *Res Gestae,* xxx: 9, 5. The references given with the Themistius are to the pages in Dindorf's edition. The writer is indebted to Dr. Granville Downey for the privilege of being allowed to see in typescript his forthcoming translation of the *Orationes*.

who revert as soon as pressure is removed (80). Lack of competition produces flabbiness and sloth (82). Every institution gathers some corruption, but this can be purged without ending freedom of worship (83). There are limits to what force can do, the sword cannot touch the soul (80). Ultimately the issue has to be fought out on a theological level, and Themistius realises this. God makes all men pious, but he does not dictate a manner of approach. He leaves worship free. He who uses force, takes away what God has given. Laws which contradict God's laws, cannot be good (81). God is not to be apprehended without effort. If we allow men only one way of approach, there is no achievement in finding God (82). In an army, in the body politic, in life as a whole, there is difference of rôle and variety. God surely approves of this and does not expect one man or group to be like another. Force should not be used to impose sameness (83).

We do not know whether Themistius' arguments went home. Jovian maintained a position of neutrality if only because the Empire was too weak for anything else and the parties too evenly balanced. He died soon afterwards on 9 February 364, whether from a surfeit of food or from the fumes of a fire. No doubt Themistius' sage advice contributed something to keeping Valens and Theodosius (in his early days) from persecuting pagans. Neither hesitated to coerce heretics, though, ironically enough, Nicenes were heretics for Valens and Arians orthodox, while for Theodosius it was the other way round. It is possible that the pagan Tatian, who held high office under both Emperors, had the privilege of persecuting at the command of Christian Emperors both Athanasians and Arians.

Libanius, the great pagan orator from Antioch who is said to have been Chrysostom's tutor, probably wrote his *Pro Templis* (*Oratio* xxx) in the early summer of 388.[6] It is ostensibly addressed to the Emperor and most probably it reached him. His purpose is to establish the legal point that when the brothers Valentinian and Valens prohibited bloody sacrifice, the rest of the pagan cult was allowed to continue and that the plundering forays by Christian monastic dacoits were against the law. As his discourse proceeds one can discern some of the other grounds on which his plea for toleration is based. Priceless works of art and architecture including an Asclepius by Pheidias have been destroyed in the fanaticism religious strife begets (*capp.* 22, 44ff.). Such strife allows many to join in who have only their own material gain as their object. The pagans and their property are part of the Emperor's patrimony. Which magistrate was ever commended for destroying part of his own city? (43) The Temples are the centres and souls of the country districts and destroying their life cripples the rural areas (10). Being deprived of their old gods

[6]For a recent work on Libanius with a valuable bibliography see Glanville Downey in *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, vol. 103, no. 5 (Oct. 1959).

will not make men sincerely worshippers of new (26ff). The gods gave victory, especially the gods of Rome. That is why sacrifice continues at that city (30ff). Presumably defeat would follow cessation. Different gods have different functions; that is why sacrifices continue at Alexandria, lest the Nile should not rise (34).[7]

Most of Libanius' arguments could be turned or answered by his enemies. Whatever was the legal position new laws could and would very shortly change it. True, persecution destroyed works of art and even lives, but it was worth it to gain many souls. Christianity was well launched on her career as a religion of victory, fertility and prosperity. For 'Sol Invictus' and 'Serapis' read 'Christ'. Alas, it is even less true today than it was in the fourth century that you cannot make sincere converts by coercion. It depends on the 'follow-up'. In any case, their children are sincere. The orator makes little use of his best and most unassailable argument, but it is to his credit that he here grasps an essential of Christianity perhaps more clearly than some of his patristic contemporaries. He says the laws of the Christians themselves disavow violence and approve persuasion (29).

It is clear that on his premisses St. Augustine gets the better of the argument. If God is one, and oneness is here understood in its bare sense, truth is not manifold, true religion is unitary and its manifestations must be uniform. All else is false. When we are in a minority we ask for toleration, for we are the truth. When we are a majority we persecute, for all else is false and offends God. You cannot oppose this on grounds of expediency, nor of antiquity, nor with sentimental talk of more ways than one. Nor is it enough to say that one has a feeling that intolerance contradicts the spirit of the Gospels. We are dealing ultimately with a misunderstanding of what unity and uniqueness mean. The Church was forced to discover a concept of multiplicity in unity to explain the facts of the Trinity and of Christology. In thinking of the Incarnation the Church discovered a concept of uniqueness which respected other forms of the same principle. But these insights were not brought to bear on ecclesiology or the uniqueness of Christianity. Thanks to the Christian missionary movement of the last 150 years, and her strapping son, the oecumenical movement, the Churches and the religions find the world too small in which merely to co-exist. Since at least the Tambaram Conference of 1938 frantic re-thinking has been going on, even inside the scarlet curtain. The highest point reached so far is in Kenneth Cragg's *Call of the Minaret* (Oxford, 1956). But as long as most Christians remain under the yoke taken by Augustine from the Theodosians, ultimately no dialogue is possible.

[7]One is reminded of rural Anglicanism and Methodism in England, only the situation is worse, for the buildings cannot be allowed to fall into ruin, even though the congregations, the clergy and ministers are no longer there.

CHRISTIANITY AND OTHER FAITHS

By E. G. Parrinder, Reader in the History of Religions, University of London.

Never till modern times has Christianity as a whole had to face the fact of the existence and challenge of a number of quite different religious systems from its own. The significance of this fact is still veiled from many Christian thinkers, and theologians seem to withdraw more and more into their narrow circle, but many of the laity are aware of these non-Christian faiths and some are deeply attracted by them.

In the Middle Ages we faced Islam, it is true, but our relationships were not the happiest, and the bloody history of the Crusades was more than enough to counterbalance persecutions by the Turks. The Arab world has still not forgotten the extermination of the inhabitants of Jerusalem by the victorious first crusaders, and only now are there small attempts at mutual dialogue between Muslims and Christians. Some of the Jesuit missionaries in India and China, in the sixteenth century, made efforts to appreciate Hinduism and Confucianism, but these were forbidden by authority and their achievements lost. Only in the last century has serious study of Asian religions been undertaken and much remains to be done.

Many members of the general public are well aware of the claims of other faiths. *The Times* last year had an article on *Eastern Faiths in Britain*; this was in fact almost wholly in London, and listed the Buddhist Society, Ramakrishna Mission, Muslim cultural centres and mosques, and temples of Sikhs, Parsis, Bahais and others. Some of these organizations, of course, exist to serve their own nationals, but several are definitely missionary and are making converts in this country. This in itself is a new situation; the East returning the compliment in sending missionaries to convert Europeans.

We are always being told that this is one world, and certainly ease of travel brings people of many religions face to face. Not only are there the Orientals who visit the West, but greater numbers of Europeans than ever have been to the East: in colonial services, trade, education, and above all in the armed forces during and since the two wars. So our laity can no longer be fobbed off with fairy tales, or pleas of ignorance about eastern religions; they often know more about them than the clergy. For, owing to the narrow range of theological studies, most ministers know nothing at all of subjects that interest many laymen, e.g. reincarnation, karma, or nirvana.

Never before has there been such a vast amount of literature about other religions, and the flow seems ever-increasing. Some of this literature is biased and cranky, but there is a great deal of accurate and cheap material available. Some missionaries (but only a small minority) have been interested in translating the scriptures of other faiths, and one thinks of classic examples like Carey, Legge, Soothill, Macnicol, and others. But now

translations and introductions pour from the presses and have a large sale. Christmas Humphreys' Pelican *Buddhism* sold hundreds of thousands, Conze's *Buddhist Scriptures,* not an easy book, was sold out in a few weeks, and similar wide sales have greeted Penguins on *Islam* and the *Koran*. Murray's cheap *Wisdom of the East* series has popularized eastern classics for years, and a recent addition is the series *Ethical and Religious Classics of East and West* published by Allen and Unwin. There are innumerable others, and many new introductions to all the religions that quite outdate the older ones that some of us were brought up on. Many people buy these books and show a keen interest in 'religion' in a way of which the churches are virtually ignorant.

Even more significant is the revival and reformation of non-Christian religions. It is debatable how far this is a religious revival, and how much it is one aspect of nationalism; probably the two are inextricably mingled, but this only shows how much religion imbues cultures. In Turkey, scene of the greatest attacks on Islamic authority, recent years have seen a revival of Muslim practices; the call to prayer restored again to Arabic after a short period in Turkish, the pilgrimage to Mecca assisted by government, the Prime Minister hailed as a holy man after his escape from an air accident and camels sacrificed for him in the streets of Ankara and Istanbul. In Ceylon and Burma the strength of the Buddhist faith is seen in its reaction against privilege in education and government. In both Hinduism and Islam reforms are proceeding, against caste, polygamy, and the like, that will make it impossible for the Christian to point an accusing finger at social abuses that were not necessarily implied in the religion but made good debating points in the past.

It is, then, no longer possible to ignore the existence of non-Christian religions or the reforms taking place in them. Recognition of this fact is essential for Christian missions, but also for the Church as a whole. The hard fact of the existence of different faiths, to which hundreds of millions of our fellow human beings are devoted, must be recognized. 'The evangelization of the world in this generation', once the bold cry of the Student Christian Movement, has not been realized in any more than the general sense of preaching the Gospel in nearly every land and making groups of converts in the more favourable ones. This is not meant to deny the missionary task of the Church, which has been implicit since the first century, but different methods are needed; and certainly it must be seen that Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism, and the like, are here to stay, at least for centuries yet.

If theologians will not rethink their position, others will do it for them. Arnold Toynbee has been much concerned with world religious problems, and in *An Historian's Approach to Religion,* and his smaller *Christianity among the Religions of the World,* he tries to show that religions are complementary to each other and that Christianity must be

willing to learn from others. Similarly Philip Ashby in *The Conflict of Religions* suggests that we have unexpected allies, and need no longer have rivals, in the other great religions which share with us a profound belief in the spiritual nature of the universe and are on our side against the prevalent materialism and practical atheism of these days. R. C. Zaehner, a Roman Catholic layman, in *At Sundry Times,* sees other faiths as preparations for the Gospel; it is more natural to find the Gospel foreshadowed in India than in Greece, and Christ fulfils the 'gospel according to the Gentiles', 'as it was preached in India and Iran'.

The latest study is E. L. Allen's *Christianity among the Religions* (Allen and Unwin, 18/-). Here at last we have a book from a philosopher-theologian, who was at one time a missionary in China, and has travelled extensively in Asia and Africa as well as being a noted lecturer and writer in this country. Dr. Allen's is perhaps the most useful work on this subject so far. His book is well written, follows through consecutive lines of thought, and finally considers various possible alternative attitudes with fine discrimination. There is no doubt of his Christianity, nor yet of his desire to be fair to other religions, recognize the good in them, and work towards a new approach to them.

This book begins with history, the Christian confrontation with Islam and the few attempts that were made to understand it. 'It was in the thirteenth century that Western Christendom began to be shaken in the conviction that it possessed the absolute truth.' But little came of tentative approaches by Ramon Lull and Francis of Assisi, and even Nicholas of Cusa who was ready to see truth in the Qur'an believed that it was merely copied from Christianity and that Muhammad deliberately deceived his followers. Even by the Reformation so little was known or understood of Islam that Zwingli, willing to see Hercules and Socrates in heaven, repeated the current slanders about Muhammad without examination.

Dr. Allen gives useful chapters to the rationalist and romantic attitudes to non-Christian scriptures as they became known in the nineteenth century, noting that Schopenhauer was so impressed by Du Perron's bad translation of the Upanishads from a Persian version that he rejected later and better translations direct from the Sanskrit. Faced with the formal Christianity of their day Herder, Schleiermacher and Schopenhauer all distinguished Christianity from the teaching of Christ, and the last-named writer thought that the New Testament 'must be in some way traceable to an Indian source'.

When he comes to consider possible Christian attitudes to other faiths Dr. Allen tries to steer a way between extremes of rejection and complete assimilation. He recognizes the validity of an appeal to mysticism, but declares that this is 'central for India, marginal for Christianity'. Here he lays himself open to the judgement of R. C. Zaehner who has criticized the 'Protestant mistrust of mysticism'. No doubt this is found in extreme

form in the Barthian school which, significantly enough, rejects both mysticism and any attempt at finding points of contact with any other religion whatsoever. But Zaehner is right in saying that this leaves out of account 'the whole mass of Pauline and Johannine teaching which is mystical to the core'. Dr. Allen is unfortunate in decrying mysticism and otherworldliness and asking 'what has this in common with . . . Wesley's hymns?' For Wesley's hymns, more perhaps than any other English hymns, are profoundly mystical; whether it be the verses to 'thou great mysterious God unknown', or 'thou hidden love of God whose height, whose depth unfathomed no man knows', or the declarations that 'man shall then be lost in God'.

Despite this lapse Dr. Allen steers a careful path between the fundamentalists and Barthians (including the missionary-theologian Kraemer) who hold that 'all religions are false save one's own', on the one hand, and those on the other 'who maintain that all religions are equally true', and then, like many theosophists, 'invariably go on to assert that certain religions are in grave error because they do not recognize this'. But he consistently maintains that it is only fair and charitable to do to other religions as we would be done by and 'put on them the best possible interpretation'.

His own sympathies are with Franck and Schelling, for whom Christ is both latent and manifest, 'the light that lighteneth every man'. Christ is manifest in the Christian community, but he is also latent elsewhere. It is a mistake to suppose that one religion is true and another false, for truth and error are in all religions. If one religion is regarded as absolute truth it will be one's own; Islam and Buddhism would make the same claim, and then the choice would be between dogmatisms.

If we are to be judged by conduct Christians have often been in error. When the World Peace Pagoda was opened in Rangoon in 1956 it was said that Western Christianity had proved itself a warlike faith, and the world needed Buddhism as the religion of peace. Someone has said recently that Russia need spend no money on anti-American propaganda in Asia; Hollywood does it much better for them. The cheap American films that flood Asia depict Western life as vulgar luxury, gross sensuality, and unrestrained violence. If that is the American way of life, and America is a Christian country, then Hinduism or Buddhism are better religions by the fruits they produce. At least it is salutary to see ourselves as others see us, and not only as we see ourselves—the sole purveyors of culture to the world. The West has long had a reputation for violence. So Allen says, 'the Christian who hears for the first time of Asoka notes with shame the contrast with his own imperial patron, Constantine'.

Christian self-righteousness is to be rejected in the doctrinal as well as the moral sphere. It is not enough to view the non-Christian religions as preparations for the Gospel. 'Confucius and Buddha claim attention

in their own right and not merely for the service they can render to Christianity.'

When it is asserted that any religion is absolute, it must be asked to which form of the religion one is referring. Hegel identified the absolute religion with Lutheranism, and we might well smile at that. H. R. Mackintosh spoke of the absolute claim of certain doctrines which express the action of God. But these are 'the reaction of man' to God, 'each of them capable of many interpretations'. Allen regards Troeltsch's argument as unanswerable, 'there is not anyone alive who is effectively in a position to judge between his own religion and his neighbour's'.

How then can we act towards other religions? Two interesting parallels are given. In the ecumenical movement the divergent opinions of the churches have been more sharply defined than before, through being examined openly; yet Christians are also more aware of their fundamental unity than hitherto. The same thing may happen between the religions, not by disregarding points of difference, but by coming together at the spiritual (and mystical) level.

Then in discussion with members of other faiths in a rational manner, there will be argument and counter-argument which may not prove any faith indubitably. But there is a parallel here with arguments for the existence of God. They cannot demonstrate God, who is apprehended only by faith. But the arguments are not valueless. 'They express and confirm a faith in God that is already present, they make clear to those who do not share that faith what we believe and what we do not believe.'

In the dialogue between the religions, which has been going on here and there, Christians may become aware that there are truths, spiritual perceptions, of which our watertight Hebrew-Greek doctrinal systems are unaware. There are truths that we can learn from the East: e.g. the love of God for his own sake, or the sense of the immensities of space and time that are at God's disposal. There are further depths in the wisdom of God to be explored. There is the latent and the manifest Christ. This awaits the understanding of Christendom. 'The complete Christ, it may be, includes a glory in the latent Christ that waits to be recognized and appropriated by those who know him only as manifest.'

CONSTANCE CHATTERLEY

By Hugh Montefiore, Fellow and Dean of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge

Public discussion about sexual intercourse is bound to touch raw nerves; and perhaps the cause célèbre of *Lady Chatterley's Lover* is still too near us to enable us to see it in proper perspective. Nevertheless, the case involves so many important issues that it demands contemporary comment. The whole matter has been grossly over-simplified in the press and in personal statements, and a balanced view is impossible until a number of important issues have been disentangled.

In the first place, is the novel a good book? Each person is entitled to his own opinion, but few critics would put it in the first class. (It is significant that Dr. Leavis, whom no one could accuse of underestimating Lawrence, was not called on to testify in favour of the book by the defence.) D. H. Lawrence distrusted cerebration, and his novels have a 'hit or miss' quality about them. This book certainly does not score a bull's-eye. It seems ill thought out, and in parts it is boring.

But a mediocre or even a bad novel can contain excellences. Lawrence believed passionately in the goodness and rightness of sex. In this novel he describes more than once the sex act emotively, sympathetically, even beautifully. He was uncompromisingly opposed to a gnostic view of human nature which regards sex as nasty and which despises the natural and earthy realities of human life. In a sense sex is his god. He believed that he could communicate what he regarded as his 'gospel' by describing with realism and tenderness the intimacies of sexual intercourse. There is nothing shocking in the suggestion that Christians can learn something here from Lawrence. Christians can indeed learn things from non-Christians: as Professor MacKinnon said in his Inaugural Lecture at Cambridge on 18 November this year, 'God is not ecclesiastically manageable'. But while Christians can learn from Lawrence about the unashamed pleasure and the goodness of sexual intercourse, they differ from Lawrence in as much as they regard the act as sacramental in a deeper sense, a sacrament of union between two *whole* persons. Connie and the gamekeeper are ill-matched bed-fellows. They have no real spiritual, social or intellectual intercourse: their sexual intercourse effects emotional union, but it is not properly sacramental. Lawrence's view of sex seems phallic, while the Christian view is sacramental. While Lawrence's descriptions of the sex act are to be preferred to those sterile and clinical descriptions in books of sex instruction, they fall far below genuine Christian insight into the sex act.

Should this book be published? Here the moral issue must be distinguished from the legal issue. The objections raised have been twofold.

Firstly, the novel is concerned with an adulterous relationship, and Christians at least agree that adultery is wrong. But very many modern novels, if they are not concerned with adultery, describe some kind of sexual deviation. They are rightly published without prosecution on this score. It would be wrong to place on a civic (or any other kind of) Index a book merely because it is concerned with adultery. Novels must describe life as it is actually lived, if they are to be authentic; and, after all, no one is forced to read them. Secondly, Lawrence's novel describes the intimacies of the sex act and employs well-known but hitherto unpublished terminology. Is there not a place here for 'decent reticence'? Once again it must be pointed out that no one is forced to read the book. It is, I think, a pity that it has been published at 3/6, and the attitude of the publishers is at least open to question: it might seem that they have been more concerned with coining money than with striking a blow for freedom. I think that most people would agree that there *is* a place for decent reticence. If the sex act may be described in print, I think that it would be generally agreed that it may not be filmed. But there has come a time when it is proper to allow a decent reticence to be broken in print in view of the prevalence of revolting literature on the subject of sex. Personally, I find *Lady Chatterley's Lover* more wholesome than the suggestive pornography, in print and in photography, which floods this country with apparent impunity. Sex screams at us from advertisement hoardings, magazines, paper-backs and pop songs: usually it titillates by its suggestiveness and corrupts by its superficiality. If Lawrence does not have the whole truth about sex, at least he is clean and wholesome. It is preferable that a teenager may, if he wishes, read Lawrence rather than the muck with which he is surrounded.

The Director of Public Prosecutions may well have much on his conscience. Many will now read *Lady Chatterley's Lover* simply for the descriptions of the sex act. Had there been no public prosecution, there would have been little publicity and less notoriety. As it is, thirteen-year-olds have been queueing to buy it. The damage that the book would inevitably have caused has been multiplied a thousandfold by the abortive legal action. It has caused people to look on the book in a dirty-minded way, and it was the public prosecution which put this idea into the minds of very many people. When I bought my own copy of the Penguin edition, I was interested to note that the shop assistant tried to hide it in a paper bag for me. She was surprised when I asked her to desist. 'Of course I shan't read it myself,' she told me with a look.

The trial itself was strange. It would approach contempt to suggest that the judicial summing up was not impartial; but at least it was different from what might have been expected. *The Times* alleged in a leading article that 'bishop for bishop, don for don' might have been brought to testify against publication. Why was this not done? Did the prosecution

intend to appear half-hearted? The answers to these questions are unknown; but we cannot help asking them.

The Bishop of Woolwich was only one of those who testified in favour of publication. The issue was not whether the book is obscene, but whether it has literary or other merits that justify publication. The idea that the Bishop intended to condone adultery is absurd; but at times he spoke ambiguously, as he has recognized in a public apology. (It would be tragic if anyone should commit adultery or fornication as a result of his misunderstood and misreported testimony.)

But at least he spoke out. He was prepared to testify, as a spokesman of the National Church should testify, about moral issues confronting the nation. He caught the ear (and the eye) of the nation. At times he seems to have spoken injudiciously. (For if all sexual intercourse is communion, it is not all holy. And one may justifiably joke about sex, but not about the intimacies of the sex act.) But at least he placed before the nation something of the unashamed goodness and the God-given wholesomeness of the Christian doctrine of sex. He was positive in what he said. He saw something of the complexity of the issue; for it is possible that in an adulterous relationship (which is wrong) a man and a woman may find something which is true and precious and morally good.

The National Church desperately needs this kind of prophecy today. The Bishops, of course, deserve our respect: they are our Fathers-in-God. It is probably true to say that there has never been a time when the bishops have been more conscientious in their pastoral duties towards their flocks, and never a time when they have had so little impact on the nation as a whole. Can it be that they are such good pastors that most of them forget how Jesus was regarded by the common people primarily as a prophet? When have we heard the Bench speaking out to the nation loudly and clearly about British responsibilities towards South-West Africa or Nyasaland? When we remember the witness of Temple, is it not tragic that we listen in vain for prophecy about wild-cat strikes, or sending a fellow-worker to Coventry, or management's policies on employment and dividends? The attention of the episcopate seems to be fully occupied with pressing matters of ecclesiastical concern; filling growing lists of vacant benefices, settling canon law, attempting to reconcile divided parishes or disunited Christendom. But God is as much concerned with the whole nation as with that part of it who are practising Christians. The former will heed only to words of prophecy. Nowadays we seem to acquiesce in the phrase 'the Anglican Church', a sect among sects. But the Church is still the *Church of England* as by law established, and we expect the spokesmen of our Church to speak as much to all England as to the faithful laity.

The Archbishop of Canterbury spoke at his Diocesan Conference about the Bishop of Woolwich, and he publicly rebuked him. No doubt his

intentions were excellent, but he seemed to give the world the impression that it already has; namely, that the Church thinks that sex is nasty, and that adultery is the sin against the Holy Ghost. Is it right that the Archbishop should publicly rebuke a fellow-Bishop without remonstrating with him privately and, if need be, asking him to apologise about or withdraw a statement that he may have made? Is it right for our leading spokesman to make a public pronouncement about sex that is purely negative in character? Whatever the answer to these questions may be, is it not significant that only one letter appeared in print to regret this action, and that this letter was signed by men who are outside diocesan jurisdiction?

REVIEWS

MAN: BEGINNINGS AND ENDS[1]

This is a remarkable book by a remarkable man, to quote Sir Julian Huxley. Pierre Teilhard was born in France in 1881 and died in 1955. He became a Jesuit when a young man. Bergson's *Evolution Creatrice* inspired him with a profound interest in the theory of evolution which a training in geology and palaeontology enabled him to test and verify as a scientific hypothesis. As a Jesuit he felt it incumbent upon him to reconcile the claims of Christian theology with the verified hypotheses of science. In 1923 he went on a palaeontological mission to China which inspired him to write *La Messe sur le Monde*, a religious and philosophical essay. When his religious superiors read it they forbade him to teach any longer. From 1926 he was engaged on palaeontological research in China, taking part in a number of expeditions, one of which led to the discovery of Peking man. In 1938 he completed *Le Phénomène Humain*, but permission to publish it or any of his later philosophical works was refused. In 1946 he was forbidden to stand for a professorship in the College de France, and by 1951 his position in France had become so difficult that he removed to New York, where he worked on anthropological studies at the Wemer-Grun Foundation until his death. He was persuaded to leave his manuscripts to a friend so that they could be published after his death.

Teilhard de Chardin is not of course the first theologian to strive to reconcile the facts and theory of evolution with the postulates of theism. He is, however, the first dedicated Roman Catholick priest and probably the first trained geologist and palaeontologist to do so. Within our own communion Canon Raven has for many years maintained that the coincidences which must be assumed to create nature's complicated patterns of action are so many that it is more rational to explain them as the product of inner urges towards plan and design than as the outcome of external accidents. From this suggestion has followed the claim that man has been created within the whole revolutionary process and that the Christ is the ernest of a new creation in a process manifesting at every stage the creative Spirit whose purpose and end is revealed in the Christian's object of worship. Both his Gifford Lectures and his Riddell Lectures expounded this theme for which he is qualified both as a theologian and as an ornithologist with much experience in field-work.

It may well then be wondered if it is an exaggeration to call Teilhard de Chardin 'an original thinker of something that might be called genius' to quote the blurb on the jacket. But anyone who has read *The Phenomen of Man* will hardly think otherwise. Raven as a theologian has shown how it is possible to view the whole evolutionary process as at once creative, redemptive, and working towards new integrations or wholes; Smuts also analysed the process as one of the creation of wholes extending life in range and depth. But Teilhard de Chardin writes as a scientist who happens to be a Christian rather than as a theologian who is also a scientist. For him all the sciences are histories which describe the history of the universe each by their own methods as they are found to be suitable for the particular period appropriated to them. For him man is a phenomenon within this historical process, the most recent phenomenon, but developing and evolving into a higher species, Teilhard de Chardin seeks to map out the history of the phenomenal universe. 'What I depict is not the past *in itself* but as it must appear to an observer standing on the advanced peak where evolution has placed us' (p. 35). The stuff of the universe he takes as energy, but energy he divides into two forms: (1) the measure of that which

[1] *The Phenomenon of Man*, by Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, translated by Bernard Wall. Introduction by Sir Julian Huxley (Collins; 25/-).

passes from one atom to another in the course of their transformations called by him 'tangential energy' linking components of energy together, and (2) 'radial energy', or inner energy driving components of energy on to greater complexity and centricity. Radial energy may further be envisaged as spiritual energy, surplus or free energy. Evolution is a process of *complexification* which, to quote from Sir Julian Huxley's introduction, includes (p. 15) 'the genesis of increasingly elaborate organization during cosmogenesis, as manifested in the passage from subatomic units to atoms, from atoms to inorganic and later to organic molecules, and then to cells, to multicellular individuals, to cephalized metazoa with brains, to primitive man, and now to civilized societies'. Thus it may be said that at every period of the history of the universe is a process of increasing complexification within an enclosed particle or unit until the particular is drawn in upon itself, until it bursts and a new unit of organism comes into being. Thus the stars are still laboratories in which the evolution of matter proceeds in the direction of large molecules (p. 50). Thus the earth became covered with what Teilhard de Chardin calls the biosphere, i.e. the appearance of life, and then with the turning in of itself 'not only of the nervous system but of the whole being, i.e. with the appearance of man it was covered with the "noosphere" '. Teilhard de Chardin ventures to predict that with the likelihood that man must now become one community and with his having become conscious of his past and his physical environment *in toto*—both of these are forms of complexification, a self-involution—man is being prepared for a development on to a new level. Then our planet will arrive at maturation. He designates this the Omega towards which the whole process is tending. This consummation he suggests may happen in peace or as the outcome of a final struggle (Armageddon?) between those seeking to fulfil themselves *collectively* upon themselves or those seeking to fulfil themselves *personally* on a being greater than themselves, 'Universal love,' he writes, 'would only vivify and detach finally a fraction of the noosphere so as to consummate it—the part which decided to "cross the threshold" ' (p. 289).

This is of course only a bare summary of Teilhard de Chardin's metaphysical treatise. It will have served its purpose if the reader is stimulated to read the book itself. By his concept of radial energy he seemes to indicate a possible way of correlating spiritual activity with the physicist's concept of energy. From that he can regard man as a complex centre of energy which has become conscious of itself and as the ernest of units still more complex in terms of consciousness and understanding. But he supports his thesis by a scientific description of the total process, showing himself at home with all the relevant sciences, particularly those of biology and palaeontology. His description is persuasive not just because it is scientifically accurate but especially because he draws attention to the similarity in form which each period of the evolutionary process bears to the others. This is a book which no one who has cause of Christian thought at heart can afford to ignore.

H. C. Snape

DEMYTHOLOGIZING

This book[1] is the English translation by Bishop Stephen Neill of Professor Giovanni Miegge's *L'Evangelo e il Mito nel Pensiero di Rudolf Bultmann*, which first appeared in 1956. In it the author, who is Professor of Church History at the Waldensian Faculty of Theology at Rome, discusses the relation between Bultmann's conception of the 'Gospel', the essential 'message' of Christianity, and the nature and role of 'myth' in the proclamation of this 'message'. The method adopted is both

[1] *Gospel and Myth in the Thought of Rudolf Bultmann*, Giovanni Miegge (Lutterworth Press (1960) pp. viii + 152; 25/-).

skilful and successful. The author begins by outlining the nature of the problem of 'demythologizing the New Testament 'as originally stated by Bultmann in his *Offenbarung und Heilsgeschehen* (Revelation and the Event of Redemption) 1941. He then traces the process by which Bultmann, in his work as historical and form-critic of the New Testament, came to see the problem in terms of demythologizing. In this section the author gives us a scholarly, lucid and accurate account of Bultmann's views on the importance of eschatology in the religious thinking of first century Palestine: of the relation between certain 'mythological' elements belonging to the Hellenistic world view and St. Paul's doctrine of the 'justification by faith' which Bultmann interprets in, characteristically, existentialist fashion as 'the expression of a profound internal revolution, a transformation of the *Daseinverstandnis*, of the apostle's understanding, or rather of his apprehension, of the nature of human existence' (p. 35); and finally of certain mythological Gnostic elements present in the Fourth Gospel, which have, however, been transformed so that 'the cosmological dualism of Gnosticism has become in John a dualism of decision' (p. 53). From this discussion, three features of Bultmann's formulation of the demythologizing problem become clear. First, the essential 'message' of Christianity lies in the *'kerygma'* of the primitive Christian community, that is, in 'the proclamation of Christ crucified and risen from the dead understood as the saving act of God in the world, the *Heilsgeschehen,* the eschatological event'. Secondly, the *'kerygma'* of the New Testament is expressed by means of mythological elements borrowed from 'mere myths' (reviewer's term). These mythological elements must be eliminated because they run counter to the modern man's scientific outlook on the world. Thirdly, the most appropriate means of communicating the essential message, the *kerygma,* to the twentieth century is in terms of the ideas of Existentialist philosophy.

This leads the author to what is the most interesting and stimulating section of his book, namely the chapters on 'Existentialism and Philosophy', and on 'Myth, Religion, and Philosophy'. Here the author's philosophical ability, his powers of careful analysis and exposition of difficult philosophical viewpoints, emerge clearly. Here also is revealed a very sensitive and sympathetic interpreter of Bultmann's thought, who does not offer uncritical acceptance or adulation of his views. A short review will allow mention of a few only of the many interesting points discussed in this section.

First, he clearly expounds how Bultmann's interpretation of the *kerygma* in existentialist terms becomes a call to renounce security in the visible and material world, and to recognise that there is no security except in utter and complete surrender to God; this is the true meaning of existence. Secondly, Bultmann's existentialist interpretation of the *kerygma* as 'Christ for me' is placed squarely in its historical lineage, namely, that prominent strand in continental Protestant theology stemming from Luther which makes subjective individual experience the sole ground of religious conviction. Thirdly, Bultmann, the author emphasises, never maintained that the *kerygma* could be translated without remainder into existentialist terms; he is not guilty, as some critics have maintained, of destroying the essence of the Christian 'message' by reducing it to the status of a mere philosophical idea. Indeed, Bultmann recognises that the *kerygma* represents the *only* way by which the Christian message can be expressed. Thus the *kerygma* is myth in the profound sense, not of mere myth, but in the sense that only in this form can religious claims about the action of God in Christ be communicated at all. This then is the real problem which the 'demythologizing controversy' was meant by Bultmann to introduce; how can we both affirm and communicate supernatural truths in a cultural climate which at every point, either directly or indirectly, denies the existence of the supernatural? Those critics of Bultmann, we are told, who seek to defend the whole

mythological picture of the New Testament by insisting on the interpretation of myth through transition to symbol and analogy can only do so if myth is regarded as 'irrational', and this line of defence betrays dependence on thought derived from the Romantic period. Bultmann, on the other hand, *appears* to demythologize the New Testament, whereas in fact what he does is not to eliminate myth, but 'make plain that these myths are not really myths, and basically never have been myths. But if this is so, what is there in fact left to demythologize? May it not seem that this hullabaloo of academic controversy about the elimination of the mythological from the New Testament has really been a litlte excessive?' (p. 120).

In his final chapter the author gives a judicious assessment of Bultmann's attempt to demythologize the Gospel. Sympathetic to the framework of thought within which Bultmann moves, he rightly criticises Bultmann's ambiguous use of 'myth'; his 'almost complete identification of the Jesus of history with the Christ of faith' (p. 127); his tendency to concentrate 'the whole message of the Gospel in the single theme of justification by faith', whereas 'the centre of the faith has always been Christ in himself' in contrast to Bultmann's insistence on 'Christ for me' (p. 133). Finally, we are given, as an appendix, a short but informative review of Roman Catholic discussions of Bultmann's views on demythologizing.

As as examination of Bultmann's writings with a view to illuminating and clarifying the issues involved in 'demythologizing the New Testament', *'Gospel and Myth'* is wholly admirable and is a worthy contribution to the discussion of the important issues raised by that controversy. It certainly justifies Bishop Neill's conviction that the work ought to be available in English, and English readers stand greatly in his debt for undertaking the task of translation. An adequate and useful index has been provided.

I have three criticisms to offer. The first refers to the bibliographical note at the end which gives a list of works published in English on demythologizing. This list is far too short, and might usefully have been extended. Secondly, in the historical account of the development of Bultmann's view, the omission of any reference to the debate which occurred in 1923 between Barth and Harnack on the legitimacy of historical methods in the criticisms of the Scriptures—a debate which greatly influenced Bultmann and in which he sided with Barth—is a strange omission.[2] And finally a more serious criticism can be levelled against the short last chapter (pp. 125-137) in which the author draws together the strands of his discussion. In the course of this discussion he has rightly discerned that the genuine issue raised by Bultmann is the problem of expressing and justifying 'truths of religion' in the context of a world-view which basically rejects the notion of the supernatural. If this is so, we are led to wonder, as Professor Miegge has not, whether Bultmann's answer is adequate. For Bultmann, the crux of the matter lies ultimately in his conception of history, which, as Professor Miegge rightly observes, he assimilated very early in his theological career, and for which he was particularly indebted to Dilthey and Croce. It is not surprising that much later, in his Gifford Lectures, *History and Eschatology* (1957), Bultmann can praise R. G. Collingwood's *Idea of History,* which has much in common with the views on history of Dilthey and Croce. This conception of history is essentially Idealist in form, and owes not a little to the Romantic period of thought, which Professor Miegge rightly discerned as lying behind some of the criticism of Bultmann's definition of myth. It is Bultmann's notion of history, with its Romantic and Idealist roots, which is in more urgent need of analysis and criticism than Bultmann's borrowings from Existentialism. When the whole idea of

[2]Vide Barth: Die Christliche Welt, reprinted in *Theologische Fragen und Antworten*, 1957, 'Ein Briefwechsel mit Adolf Harnack', p. 7-31.

'the eschatological event'[3] is rigorously examined, one suspects that much of Bultmann's elaborate structure of demythologizing will collapse. In the last analysis, the real difficulty does not lie in asserting supernatural claims about *the past*; the problem is how to justify supernatural claims about the present, *the here and now*. This is essentially a philosophical problem, and once this is solved, the working out of a Christian view of history will, in principle, be a simple and straightforward task. In the meantime we may begin to get back on the right road towards a solution of this philosophical problem if theologians, among them Professor Miegge, can be persuaded to abandon the notion, all too frequently implied in the work of Barth, Bultmann, and other Continental theologians, that it is possible to 'believe in' a person without, at the same time, being committed to certain assertions of fact, or of supposed fact, about that person. And if the person 'believed in' lived in the past, these assertions of fact will be, by definition, historical statements, whose truth or falsity can be investigated by the methods of historical science. Bultmann first fell from grace when he sided with Barth against Harnack!

T. A. Roberts

[3]Bishop Niell confesses in his Translator's Foreword that the phrase, 'the eschatological event', is not English, but the frequency of it appearance in the work of Bultmann, Barth and Miegge forced him to use it. These Continental theologians are being assiduously copied in this matter by a host of American and some English theologians. Meanwhile, as Miegge points out in a footnote on p. 61, Bultmann's ideas about history 'are not unrelated, in the field of biblical exegesis, to C. H. Dodd's realized eschatology'. For this point, compare the last chapter of C. H. Dodd's *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments* and *History and the Gospel*.

AN ENGLISH MYSTIC

In a letter to Father Tyrrell, Baron von Hügel points out that the truly 'exceptional' person is 'never queer', but is always 'supremely normal'. He says that this is due to the fact that at bottom all men are moved by desires and aspirations after something higher and better than themselves, though they may start at a very low primitive level. Thus the 'saint' is the 'exceptional' person in whom these confused longings have become clarified, purified and deepened, because they are fulfilled in God. This was certainly true of Evelyn Underhill. She was not 'like' anyone else—even on her own high plane. She was simply *herself*: a many-sided, delightful, witty, lovable, and fascinating person, who touched life at many points, and *cared* greatly for people. Yet there was a mystery and a reticence about her which makes us realize that she (like other less 'exceptional' people) could never reveal herself fully to any other human being. This makes the task of the biographer very difficult. Those who read this account[1] without any previous knowledge of the subject will doubtless be interested in the outward setting of her life, and in her attractive human characteristics. Many readers, perhaps, will see no more than a pleasant story of a 'good' woman; some will be surprised that someone so 'religious' could also be interested in various crafts, in sailing, and the world of the Law, as well as in flowers and art and children and cats!

Those, however, who have come to know and love Evelyn Underhill through her books can only be disappointed, for this 'Life' is inadequate. For there is too great a gap between the outward story and the mystery which made the saint. Such a Life needed to be written with greater insight. People who have never read anything about Evelyn Underhill, however, would be well advised to read this book for themselves, and then to go on to read Evelyn Underhill's own writings. All to whom these books 'speak' will at once recognize their quality. Evelyn Underhill was out-

[1]*Evelyn Underhill*, by Margaret Cropper (Longsmans, 25/- net).

standing in her intellectual ability, in her love of truth, and her honesty of mind. The breadth and depth of her outlook was due to the integration of her spiritual and her intellectual faculties, under the creative action of God. She wrote and spoke with authority because she knew 'what she was talking about'. In her writings, theology 'came alive'. For her one subject was: GOD; God himself, in his majesty, greatness and glory. On the walls of her study in the house in Camden Square there hung a panel containing one word which was ever before her eyes, as she worked and wrote: *Eternity*. She saw all life in this light. Hence in her teaching she constantly stressed the Priority and Prevenience of God. She urged her readers to look away from themselves to him, then to turn to the world in its need, and to take up the humblest tasks and fulfil them faithfully in the service of his Kingdom.

This book tells the story of her spiritual journey, so far as this can be gathered from the material available. It is a remarkable record: to come from a home where 'no one went to church'; to live in easy circumstances and mingle with the literary set of the day; to begin as a novelist interested in the queer and the occult; and then to pass from virtual agnosticism to a convinced theism, and to make her name with a great book on Mysticism, while still in her thirties, was certainly unusual. The writer of this book fails, however, to lay sufficient emphasis upon the great influence of Von Hügel on her development, especially during that epoch-making period of six months when she was under his close direction. This was the water-shed of her life. At the outset of this period, as she said later, she thought she was 'an intelligent and broad-minded Christian'. Writing to a close friend some time afterwards, she says: 'When I went to the Baron he said I wasn't much better than a Unitarian! Somehow, by his prayers or something, he *compelled* me to experience Christ. He never said anything more about it . . . it took about four months.' It is only when we realize the character of this experience that we can understand the difference between her two major works, *Mysticism* and *Worship*. Between them lies this experience of a fully *Christian* 'conversion', which finally brought her into the main stream of Church life and sacramental worship. It is also important to notice how, in spite of her close connexion with Von Hügel, and her own strong attraction to the Church of Rome before she knew him, she finally came to rest, quite definitely, in the Church of England. This she did without any loss of charity, or breadth of outlook, and desire for Christian unity.

In spite of much difficulty and hidden suffering, it was during the later period of her life that her great work was done. In addition to her public speeches and lectures, it was during these years that she gave what was perhaps her greatest outward service to the Church of Christ in this country. She became an expert Conductor of Retreats. No one who had the privilege of sharing in these Retreats can ever say how wonderful they were: so full of the joy of worship, of delight in the beauty of nature, of the sense of fellowship in silence. The addresses themselves were always remarkable, and they were often salted with humorous sallies! She excelled in speaking to a small group of people who were eager to receive what she had to give. Here, and all through her life, she had a special gift of understanding people, and helping them at the deepest level. Behind all this service there lay a great deal of suffering, both physical and spiritual. But she held on in faith and never ceased to care for others, whatever she might be feeling. And so in June 1941, very suddenly, in silence and darkness, she passed from our sight. But surely it was true of her, as of Gore when he lay dying, that behind the veil of consciousness was the dawning of delight. 'Transcendent Glory, transcendent Glory,' murmured Gore, and Evelyn Underhill knew too that 'Glory is the final word of religion, as joy is its final state.'

Olive Wyon

THE ENIGMA OF CHARLES KINGSLEY

For many people the name of Charles Kingsley probably conjures up a simple and uninhibited figure—the bluff exponent of 'muscular Christianity'. Yet any such idea of Kingsley as that is not merely inadequate, it is the very reverse of what was actually the case; for Kingsley is a baffling and complex personality if ever there was one. Social reformer and country parson, preacher and pamphleteer, journalist and novelist, professor of history and popularizer of natural science, courtier and canon—Kingsley was all of these. Though we may generally think of him as the happy extrovert he often appeared to be, he was also subject to moods of deep depression. Side by side with his animal good spirits and *joie de vivre* there was a frequently expressed longing for death. For example, he was never happier as a rule than when on a fishing expedition, but on one such occasion he was heard muttering: 'I wish I were dead; I wish I were dead.'

Similarly, what literary critic, with only the internal evidence to guide him, would dream of attributing the gruesome poem *Saint Maura* to the jolly Philistine who wrote *The Invitation* or *Ode to the North-East Wind*? Or again, who would have expected the author of *Two Years Ago*, with its strong bias against slavery, presently to be found in sympathy with the southern faction in the American civil war and speaking of Lincoln with patronizing contempt? No wonder that during the course of his life Kingsley became estranged from almost all his early friends. Socialism and jingo patriotism both aroused his sympathies; contemptuous of whatever he deemed superstition, he nevertheless took a serious interest in mesmerism and claimed that he was able to foretell future events. Thus, all in all, Charles Kingsley is certainly a challenging and controversial figure. And besides everything else, his life story presents us with the central problem of just how Parson Lot the Chartist, without any sudden or obvious *volte face*, became transformed into the eminently respectable Cambridge professor and cathedral dignitary, the friend of royalty and private tutor to the Prince of Wales himself.

This absence of any dramatic break with the past is particularly worth noting. For the fact is that however puzzling a figure Kingsley may be, he does not strike one at once as having been full of inconsistency. (In a sense this adds to the puzzle still further.) Facile and superficial in many ways he undoubtedly was, but he was by no means merely a chameleon or a weathercock. There was at heart an integrity and down to earth honesty about him, which is probably why we tend to think of him as an open and uncomplicated personality—which he certainly was not. At all events, it is not surprising that Charles Kingsley should still be a subject of much interest or that his life should continue to provoke fresh attempts at its interpretation.

Two studies of Kingsley appeared shortly after the war. The first of these, by the late Guy Kendall, *Charles Kingsley and His Ideas*, is still, in my judgment, the best book about him since Fanny Kingsley wrote the original life of her husband which has remained the principal source for all his subsequent biographers. Then, following Mr. Kendall, came *Canon Charles Kingsley*, by Una Pope Hennessy. Now our interest in the subject is renewed by Mr. R. B. Martin, whose *The Dust of Combat, a Life of Charles Kingsley*,[1] was published a few months ago. This is a very readable and straightforward book, but it must be confessed that Mr. Martin has not a great deal that is fresh, either by way of information or interpretation, to offer. The reader is certainly made well aware of the puzzling many-sidedness of Kingsley's character and interests, but he is left to go on feeling puzzled and rather bewildered by them at the end.

[1]Faber & Faber, 25/-. Publication date, 18th March 1960.

Mr. Martin does, however, point out that Kingsley was never really so much of a Chartist as he seemed to be, and the comparison between him and Disraeli (p. 117) is perhaps illuminating. We also learn that Kingsley's eventual favour at court owed something to the fact that his earliest work, *The Saint's Tragedy*, had been specially admired by the Prince Consort. One slight but rather surprising piece of information pp. 128-9) suggests that F. W. Robertson was among Kingsley's enthusiastic supporters. This is certainly not what one would gather from Stopford Brooke's *Life of F. W. Robertson*, and it is a pity Mr. Martin has not given his authority for stating that Robertson was present to hear Kingsley's celebrated sermon in St. John's, Fitzroy Square, which was denounced by the rector in front of the congregation.

In any book about Charles Kingsley the account of his controversy with Newman is likely to be of particular interest, and Mr. Martin has an excellent chapter upon this. On the whole he shows that Kingsley came out of the controversy rather better than he is generally thought to have done. But whether it is not going too far to describe Newman's *Apologia* as 'the greatest autobiography of the century' (p. 253) is perhaps a matter of opinion.

It is a pity that Mr. Martin has not been able to throw rather more light on Kingsley's background. A fuller account of his father's early life would have been particularly welcome. For example, when did the marriage of Charles Kingsley, senior, take place? On the face of it, it would seem unlikely that the marriage took place, as Mr. Martin seems to suggest, at some date before 1807, if the eldest of six children was not born until 1819. Again, did Kingsley senior really spend nine years, from 1807 until 1816, studying for holy orders? Fanny Kingsley says that her father-in-law went up to Cambridge for this purpose at the age of thirty, i.e. in 1811, which certainly seems more likely. In any case, it would seem more probable that Gerald Kingsley (Charles' brother) was born in 1816, the generally accepted date, not in 1821, despite the fact, which Mr. Martin points out, that he was not baptized until that year. These are all minor details, obviously; but there is the possibility that if we knew more about the elder Charles Kingsley—better still, perhaps, if we could have a full-scale life of him rather than more books about his son—our understanding of the younger Charles Kingsley would be considerably increased.

> 'My father,' the latter wrote, 'was a magnificent man in body and mind, and was said to possess every talent except that of using his talents.'

That was certainly not true of Charles Kingsley, junior. Rather it might be said of him that he used too many of his talents too fully and too freely; that he had too much of the one talent that his father did not possess. But his words may indicate that there was a sufficient resemblance between father and son to make worthwhile the attempt to interpret the one through the other. However that may be, for the present, at any rate, the enigma of Charles Kingsley still remains.

D. L. Scott

NORTHERN PROTESTANTS

When the York Diocesan archives were recently made available in the Borthwick Institute of Historical Research at York, research work upon them of the kind and calibre embodied in Mr. Marchant's book[1] first became practicable. This is certainly a most refreshing and revealing study of Northern Puritanism during its formative and indeed most formidable period, that from the early years of Queen Elizabeth until the beginning of the Civil War. Professor A. G. Dickens in his *Lollards and*

[1] *The Puritans and The Church Courts in the Diocese of York, 1560–1642*, by Ronald Marchant. (Longmans. 1960; 63/- net.)

Protestants in the Diocese of York has already thrown a great deal of fresh light on the religious history of the North from 1509 until 1558; and now Dr. Marchant takes up the story and carries it on for another eighty years. One had always been led to believe by an older generation of historians that in Tudor times at any rate the Midlands and the North were the home and stronghold of reaction and conservatism. They mothered the Pilgrimage of Grace and the Rising of the North; and, until Marston Moor, were held for the King by the Earl of Newcastle. The 'old religion', one felt, still had such a firm grip on the hearts and souls of its nobility, squires and peasants that at any moment a spark might set it alight once more. But Professor Dickens and Dr. Marchant have proved it otherwise: Lollardism was already firmly established in great commercial centres like Hull before the Reformation broke, causing grave concern to Archbishops such as Wolsey and Lee; while from the beginning of Elizabeth's reign until the election of Richard Neile, that 'Great Adversary' of the Puritan faction, a succession of northern primates from Thomas Young onwards sought to encourage the activities of the conforming puritan and rigorously suppress those of the Roman Catholics. Most puritan ministers were zealous and well-educated men; able preachers, who were tireless in their pastoral work, and proved themselves most successful missionaries of the 'New Look' in Church and State. They stood forth in strong contrast to the 'dumb dogs', the ignorant, idle, base-born priests of the old dispensation. Puritan virtues in fact far outweighed any failings they might have had in the eyes of archbishops like Grindal, Sandys, Hutton and Matthew; and a convenient 'blind eye' was largely turned on such non-conformist practices as refusing to wear the surplice, omitting the cross in baptism or the ring in marriage, and neglecting to use the Book of Common Prayer. In consequence of this 'blind eye' policy puritanism became firmly established both in Yorkshire and Nottinghamshire, especially in the larger towns and ports with their numerous outlying chapelries, where a more or less democratic system of election greatly favoured the puritan clergy.

Puritanism formed a firm alliance with the local gentry, who were often patrons of livings, and endeared itself in particular to the prosperous and rapidly growing commercial and industrial classes. But its rise to power suffered a severe set-back during the archiepiscopate of the septuagenarian and laudian Richard Neile, who, working through his officials—especially the Chancellor, Thomas Easdall, in Yorkshire, and Thomas Mottershed, Advocate-General of the North, in Nottinghamshire —sought to stamp out non-conformity in the north altogether. The result was a stream of court cases; and the puritans (incumbents, curates, churchwardens, and even some of the local gentry) were harried into conformity. However, the powers of the Church courts were limited. They could, indeed, compel a change in the outward form of Church worship, keep as a strict a watch as possible on puritanism generally, and silence the non-conformists; but their effectiveness was dependent upon accurate information, and this was hard to come by owing to the loyalty and cohesiveness of the puritanical congregations. So, despite every effort to suppress them, conventicles of one kind or another were maintained throughout Neile's primacy; while it was found equally impossible to stifle all puritan preaching. Certainly its theological, devotional and charitable activities continued unabated. Neile's failure was inevitable and understandable. He found puritanism too strongly entrenched in the towns, too closely allied politically and theologically with the local squirearchy, and too popular with the mass of the people, to destroy utterly; and time was all too short. The archbishop had also to contend both with the bitter resentment aroused by the government of the country from London through the Council of the North, and an obstinate, unshakeable assumption that his own par-

ticular brand of Arminianism was identifiable with Romanism rather than Protestanism.

This general and overall picture of the power of Puritanism in the north is mainly deduced by Dr. Marchant from the dry bones of a mass of court cases which he found among the diocesan records; and one of the dangers of this method, from which he has not entirely escaped, is to become bogged down in a morass of repetitive details, losing sight of the wood as a whole because of the thickness of the trees. Certainly this is a book which could with advantage have been compressed and shortened, so as, without losing any of its value, to have increased the readability and lowered its exhorbitant price.

Perhaps the most interesting chapter is that which deals with the story of the Pilgrimate of Grace. It has been generally believed in the past that the puritan separatists were systematically and brutally persecuted by the Church until in desperation they fled to Holland and finally emigrated to the New World. This Dr. Marchant has shown is quite untrue. The correct sequence of events was that after the very few ejections of 1605, the non-subscribers to the Canons were not merely tolerated, but permitted to stir up resistance to the Church of England as a whole; and, until 1607, actually used Anglican pulpits for this purpose. They travelled up and down the country gathering support by every means in their power and in direct contravention of what the puritans had decided at their Coventry Conference of 1606. Eventually it was Archbishop Matthew, the friend of conformist puritanism, who decided to crush the separatists by using the powers of the High Commission against some of their prominent leaders. In such action he was concerned not so much in compelling individuals to conform or in attacking liberty of conscience, as in protecting conformist puritanism against a determined attempt from outside the Church to undermine and destroy her utterly.

By no means the least interesting and valuable part of this admirable study of pre-Commonwealth Puritanism is to be found among the appendices, where Dr. Marchant has compiled a list of over 340 puritanical clergy of the York diocese with accounts of their appearances in the Church courts.

This is indeed history from the grass-roots; an attempt to get back to some of G. K. Chesterton's *Secret People*, who are the real makers of it. 'Smile at us, pay us, pass us, but do not quite forget, we are the People of England who have never spoken yet.'

K. Wood Leigh

BARTH—AND STILL MORE BARTH

This[1] is the second of, presumably, three part-volumes which are to give us Barth's 'Doctrine of Reconciliation'. The doctrine in its entirety will, we are told, consider Jesus Christ (*a*) as 'Very God' humbling himself to reconcile, a 'downward' movement in contrast to our pride; (*b*) as 'Very Man' exalted and reconciled, an 'upward' movement in contrast to our sloth, and (*c*) as 'Very God and Very Man' 'guaranteeing and attesting reconciliation'. The present volume is concerned with theme (*b*): Christ's exaltation as the royal Man.

We are here given Barth's own approach to traditional Christological doctrine, as well as his approach to the historical figure of Jesus as presented in the Gospels. Thereafter, linking closely the power and lordship of Jesus the royal Man, with the power and lordship of the Holy Spirit (for to realise the 'direction of the Son' i.e. I take it, to accept the directive of his power, is precisely to receive the Holy Spirit)

[1] *Church Dogmatics*, by Karl Barth. *Volume IV. The Doctrine of Reconciliation*. Part 2 (T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh. 55s. net. 867 pp. Editors: G. W. Bromily and T. F. Torrance.)

Barth argues that while exaltation and sanctification have already been accomplished in so far as the work of Christ has been completed, yet we participate in this exaltation and sanctification by the Holy Spirit which does *not* continue Christ's work, but rather ensures man's increasing participation in it. In this way Barth seeks to integrate both individual Christians within a community, and ecclesiology with a doctrine of reconciliation, and he shows how from such a doctrine of the Church we may learn its true nature and order, as well as the character of the *agape* which may characterize it.

In that paragraph is something of a broad survey of the present volume, and we must admire the scope—the details as well as the breadth—of Barth's discussion. Some pages may well bewilder us; the discussion may often seem repetitive; but the special notes (in smaller type) are always valuable and well-pointed, and their precision and economy is in refreshing contrast to the main text, whose merits (for the present reviewer) arise, not from any argument through which the reader may thread his way, but from the suggestive themes that come to the reader's mind when he pauses now and then to consider the broad perspective of the argument.

Turning to some more detailed points, we have already remarked that Barth here tries to give his own approach to Christological doctrine, and perhaps I should mention one point at which his new interpretation seems to me to be most valuable, and one point where it is less obviously so.

He speaks of the exaltation of Christ as the 'home-coming' of the Son of Man, using this phrase with an explicit reference to the parable of the Prodigal Son. Let us readily admit that this original use of the parable has many virtues and can be very illuminating. But plainly it is beset with difficulties of the most obvious kind which come from any sort of hint that Jesus can be paralleled with the Prodigal Son, and I am not sure that Barth is always aware of these difficulties. Even so (as I have said) we may welcome Barth's original treatment, and in the course of his discussion he gives us a number of other original and illuminating remarks such as when, for example, he speaks of the humanity of Jesus being 'a predicate without a subject'.

To come to the less satisfactory point, there is still in the book, I fear, the familiar separation of natural and supernatural, and a paragraph on page 101 defines the approach of the whole book:

> 'There is, therefore, no natural religion, no natural theology, no natural law. In all these concepts "natural" means apart from Jesus Christ, apart from the Son of God who became also the Son of Man, who is called and is also Jesus of Nazareth, who in His unity with Jesus of Nazareth has also human essence. The antithesis to this "natural" is not in the first instance the concept of "revealed", but that of human nature once for all and definitively exalted in Jesus Christ, once for all and definitively placed at the side of the Father and in fellowship with Him. Without this—and without, of course, God's revelation in it—even the True God would be to us a hidden God, and therefore in practice no God at all.'

At the same time, by the time we reach page 724, Barth is apparently willing to give some kind of respectable status to civil law. While he says at one point that 'the world and its law are evil', he continues later 'but even apart from their confrontation with the Church and its law they are not wholly evil. They are also in the hand of God and have not escaped His judgement and grace'. I am not at all clear how consistent this is with the earlier position we have quoted. But let us leave the question of consistency aside and rather recognise that, while the familiar separation of natural and supernatural on the whole dominates the work, there is nevertheless something of a new and a conciliatory tone. To me, one of the most impressive

features of this present volume is that Barth, while rightly distinguishing things that differ, can also be seen (as I have not myself seen him before) searching for a constructive synthesis. This may be seen especially in his discussion of justification and sanctification (p. 502), in his discussion of the permanent problem as to how far Christians can expect to be 'perfect' (p. 583); in the place he gives to works ('we can glory in good works for they declare God') (pp. 585-591); in his view of love and *eros* (p. 748) where he argues that even the erotic man will be fulfilled in *agape*, that God in *agape* 'espouses the cause of man', even of 'the man who loves erotically'; and finally in his discussion of the relation between love of God and love of neighbour (p. 820).

In this way Barth brings much new light on old controversies and old difficulties, and he does this in a way which not all would think of as 'Barthian'. Am I right in discerning a change of emphasis? It is a question which at the end of this review seems to demand an affirmative answer.

In the preface in the next book[2] Barth explains that his full discussion of the Doctrine of Creation will extend to three volumes. In the present volume he gives us in the main—for some 236 pages—what he calls (p. ix) 'a radical exposition of the contents of the first two chapters of the Bible'. In the third book I review he gives us his doctrine of man, and in the third part-volume we are to have his views on providence and freedom.

Let it be said at once that Barth's exposition and discussion of chapters 1 and 2 of Genesis is, as we would expect, erudite, detailed, and packed with learned references, and the reader will find much to value in this exposition. For example:

(1) Barth has some interesting remarks on the relationship between the Hebrew and Babylonian Creation stories (pp. 87-90). Those who would too easily relate, and those who would too easily contrast these stories, could read these pages with profit. The same might be said about those who too easily accept and those who too easily dismiss the concept of 'heaven and earth' of which Barth gives a good discussion (pp. 19-22).

(2) Again, Barth points out very usefully that the Creation stories must find their climax in what follows them. In other words, if they are taken in isolation, as the very phrase 'Creation narrative' suggests, their biblical point is very likely to be lost.

(3) Barth has also some very interesting reflections on the Old Testament concept of marriage (pp. 304 ff).

In short, what Barth calls his 'radical exposition' is, taken by itself, full of interest, and there are many suggestive discussions. Around this exposition of the Creation story, however, we find three major discussions:

(1) Barth criticises the claims of natural theology to have a doctrine of Creation which is quite distinct from any doctrine of Creation set in the context of Holy Scripture and regarded as the content of the divine revelation therein contained, a doctrine of Creation which is not specifically the object of Christian faith.

(2) He looks at the logical status of the Creation stories and suggests that they are to be regarded not as pure history or myth, but as what he calls *sagas*.

(3) He glances at the traditional claims for the 'benefits' of Creation, the 'actuality' and 'existence' which God gives to creatures, the 'justification' or 'righteousness' with which they are surrounded. It will be convenient to comment on (2) first and then to take (1) and (3) together.

[2] *Church Dogmatics*, by Karl Barth, *Volume III. The Doctrine of Creation. Part* 1 (T. & T. Clark, 1958. 55s. 428 pp. Authorised translation by J. W. Edwards, O. Bussey and H. Knight.)

I found his remarks on sagas very illuminating. We may not agree with his description of myth as stories which make man at home in this world. But I am sure we cannot have either the purely historical approach to the Creation narratives, nor the purely mythical or 'typological' approach, and Barth at any rate has the right intentions when he speaks of sagas as 'non-historical' depictions of history, which are concerned to set forth the 'immediacy of history to God' (p. 80).

I have left till now my point of major disagreement. Quite typically we find Barth saying that the doctrine of Creation is not native to man 'nor accessible by way of observation and logical thinking' (p. 3). A 'world cause' is 'not God' but 'a successful or unsuccessful product of the human mind' which could never be 'identical' with the *Creator coeli et terrae* (p. 11). We never know the Creator except as the gracious God the Father and (as he adds later) as the Son by the Holy Ghost in whom by eternal generation God posits himself. For Barth, it is quite a mistake to think of Genesis 1 & 2 as arising from men's reflections on the alteration of day and night, the sucession of winter and summer, the rhythm of life and death. As for the attempt of Descartes to argue from the actuality of the world to God or of Leibniz to give us a Theodicy, these are miserable attempts from the start. Creation minus God, or more accurately, minus the Christian's God, is nothing but evil. This of course is the kind of remark which puts Barth very close to David Hume.

Now let it be granted at once that for the Christian the created world will always be a revelation of God the Creator. Let it further be acknowledged that traditional metaphysics has often talked of God in a way that was religiously crude and would now be said to lack logical circumspection. But Barth starts from and ends with an impossible dualism. 'To set that which is human, worldly and rational alongside that which is Christian is inevitably to expel the latter. No man can serve two masters' (p. 414).

But why should we have such a sharp dualism? There are, I suppose, three possible attitudes that a theologian might take to the God of the philosopher's cosmology. He might say that it was the same God, but Barth will have none of that. It might be said that it was a different God, but Barth will have none of that either, and so he concludes (thirdly) that the God of the philosopher is no God at all. But why should there not be a fourth possibility, that of saying that the God of the philosopher is the same God as that of the Christian, but God seen through a glass far more darkly? Are there not, indeed, many degrees of illumination? Descartes, Leibniz, and the traditional natural theologians might well be said to have had insight and, in some sense, revelation (Cp. Locke, who speaks of reason being 'natural revelation'). Here would be insight continuous with (however much it differs from) that blinding light which Barth would say we are given in the Bible. In any case, it is not often that the blinding light comes with guaranteed formulae, or does Barth suppose that it often does? But might not self-authenticating revelation be nevertheless associated with reformable formulae and development of doctrine? Or would Barth wish to have theological language logically isolated from all other?

Barth's position would be unassailable if all Christians were perfect Christians and in their life and work and language were a class utterly apart. But plainly they are not. Barth's theology may be perfect for heaven, but in heaven his opponents would presumably be men of straw, and who would want theology in a perfect heaven, anyway?

Of the three volumes in this present review, the third volume[3] is perhaps the most

[3] *Church Dogmatics*, by Karl Barth, *Volume III. The Doctrine of Creation. Part 2* (T. & T. Clark, 1960. 55s. 661 pp. Authorised translation by H. Knight, G. W. Bromily, J. K. S. Reid and R. H. Fuller.)

significant. I regret that space does not allow a fuller treatment, but perhaps that is no drawback, since it is the volume I would most confidently commend to prospective readers to read for themselves. For it is, on the one hand, most characteristically 'Barthian' in its approach and yet, in virtue of its topic—the creature—it constantly raises and discusses issues which bring Barth alongside traditional problems of philosophical theology, and the reader will find many profitable and suggestive discussions.

Here is a doctrine of man which (as we would expect) is 'Christologically grounded'. In this setting Barth gives us first his account of man as a 'creature' and 'covenant-partner' of God; next, his concept of man not as a dualism of body and mind, but as an 'ordered unity of soul and body' (cp. p. 370). Finally, he argues, it is all the more necessary for man with an inevitable beginning and ending to his earthly life, to recognize now what is 'beyond', and so to partake of God's grace and faithfulness (pp. 632 et seq.).

As we might expect, crucial difficulties which I have already aired above, show their heads again in this volume. In particular, when Barth welcomes scientific and psychological accounts of man and, going further, argues that such views need to be evaluated by the concept of man as given by the word of God (cp. pp. 23-29), we may well ask where, on Barth's view, are to be found the epistemological bridges for such an evaluation?

But having said that, let me emphasize much more the attractive novelty of the present volume. Barth himself recognizes that there will be genuine differences of detail, and I found in this volume a Barth who is unusual and suggestive in his thinking and not at all constricted by his particular theological approach. He emphasizes, for example, firmly and clearly, the limits of any 'theological anthropology', such as his own (p. 47 et seq.); in his denial of mind-body dualism (p. 380 et seq.) he can win the applause of contemporary philosophy (he even remarks significantly (p. 394) that 'human speech is wiser than human thought'). His discussion of Time (pp. 437-640) is marked by ready acknowledgment of the difficulties of understanding the temporal character of human nature; his positive suggestion is that what will endure is something which man has shared already with God himself. This is no cut-and-dried immortality, no picture full of easy detail, and I found Barth's thinking here both suggestive and inspiring.

As usual, there are some excellent scholarly notes, and those on science, theology and Darwin; on Fichte; on Brunner; on Nietzche and on Bultmann may perhaps be specially mentioned.

Altogether, I found here a very outward-looking Barth, making genuine and fruitful contact with the problems and interests of the straight philosopher. Certainly it is this volume which I would specially commend to those who, in Schleiermacher's phrase, might be called Barth's 'cultured despisers'.

I. T. Ramsey

THE MATTHEAN GOSPEL

English-speaking students have long been in need of up-to-date commentary on the Matthean Gospel that would take proper account of all recent work bearing on the Gospel's interpretation. There was hope, when it was announced that Professor Filson would produce a commentary on Matthew in the new Black's series of New Testament Commentaries,[1] that this need would at length be met. The hope has unfortunately been disappointed; for, although on the dust-cover of the volume it is claimed

[1] *A Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew*, by F. V. Filson (A. & C. Black, London, 1960, pp. ix and 319; 28/-).

that it is a commentary, 'no less devotional than academic', its contents show that the devotional motive has clearly predominated. Accordingly, all the difficult issues which the Gospel raises are either ignored or lost sight of in pious comment. A notable instance occurs in the commentary on the Tribute Money episode in xxii, 15-22. No indication is given of the fact that for the Jews the question of paying tribute to the Romans was genuinely a religious issue of fundamental import, and that Jesus' attitude to it constitutes one of the most basic problems for our understanding of his ministry. Dr. Filson's concluding comment is typical of the inadequacy of his whole treatment of the passage: 'But the idea that he (Jesus) completely evaded the dilemma they posed would be wrong; he had alienated Jews of Zealot persuasion. But his mission was not to evade every dilemma; it was to *teach truly the way of God*' (p. 235). The words italicized here are printed in a heavy type in the book for emphasis; but no indication is given by Dr. Filson as to why those who think that Jesus 'completely evaded the dilemma' would be wrong.

Another serious issue for the understanding of the Matthean Gospel that is completely ignored, is the fact that Matthew places the appearance of the Risen Lord in Galilee, whereas the Lukan tradition locates the Resurrection Appearances exclusively in Jerusalem and its immediate neighbourhood, with the explicit statement that the disciples had been instructed by Jesus not to leave the city. That two completely divergent accounts concerning the location of the Resurrection Appearances should have arisen in so short a period constitutes a most serious problem which all students of Gospel origins must consider. This problem, moreover, is closely related to that of the place of origin of the Matthean Gospel, and on that Professor Filson is equally inadequate. He concludes his brief discussion of the matter: 'Origin of Matt. in a Jewish-Christian circle of Syria (or Phoenicia) in the eighties or nineties is the most satisfactory answer to the quest of setting the date' (p. 15). But it is obvious, in view of the above consideration, that the Matthean Gospel could not have originated near the place where the Lukan tradition was current. The most likely location for Matthew, therefore, would seem to be Alexandria, the metropolis of Egypt. But Dr. Filson, although emphasizing the fact that Matthew was written by a Jewish-Christian for Jewish-Christian readers, never considers the possibility of Alexandria as its place of origin, and that, despite the fact also that the largest Jewish population outside Palestine lived in Egypt. No significance either is seen in the remarkable fact that the most Jewish of the Gospels is also the only one that records that Jesus, the Messiah of Israel, had once actually lived in Egypt.

These criticisms have to made of the book, because the defects concerned seriously impair its value as an adequate academic interpretation of the Matthean Gospel. Since it cannot be that a scholar of Professor Filson's standing would be unaware of the important of the issues mentioned above, it must be concluded that an obligation to consider its devotional value has been the cause of the book's deficiency as an academic study.

S. G. F. Brandon

ORTHODOX JUDAISM

Among contemporary English and American exponents of the orthodox tradition in Judaism, Louis Jacobs deservedly occupies an honoured place as a clear and able thinker. In this book[1] the method which he has followed is to take each 'value' and illustrate it first from the words of Scripture and then from successive generations of rabbinical scholars from Talmudic to modern times. The result is to give us a fascinating picture of a tradition which is of millenial continuity and at the same

[1] *Jewish Values*, by Louis Jacobs (Vallentine Mitchell, 160 pp.; 21/-).

time possesses contemporary exponents. This has two particular interests for a reader who is both a Christian and a modernist. For, in so far as he is concerned with an *orthodox* presentation, he will feel exactly the same respectful disappointment as he feels towards many orthodox Christian expositions; and in so far as he is concerned with a description of *Judaism*, he will be constantly brought up against the real differences between the two religions, here described without the slightest polemic or apologetic interest.

The chapter headings are an admirable illustration of the differences in the two religions. They are: *The Study of Torah, The Fear of Heaven, The Love of God, The Sanctification of the Name, Trust in God, Holiness, Humility, The Love of Neighbour, Compassion, Truth,* and *Peace.* Of the values indicated by these eleven chapters the author says, 'these values are called Jewish because they are no remote ideals but vital forces in the lives of Jews'; they are 'dynamic principles of action rather than abstract academic ideas', and this is borne out by the fact that they are known to all Jews, whether they are Hebrew scholars or not, by familiar Hebrew words. On the other hand, 'the use of the adjective (Jewish) is not intended to suggest that these values are the invention or the exclusive preserve of Jews'.

It would be an interesting exercise to imagine a book of eleven chapters, written by a Christian of comparable scholarship and intelligence, on Christian values. How many of the headings would coincide? The first would certainly not refer to study, and it is probable that the chapters treating of the character of our relations with God would not begin with awe. Buber has written in his *Two Types of Faith* of the Christian idea of *faith* balanced by the Jewish idea of *trust*, and this difference is borne out by Dr. Jacobs' title. The most interesting omission, from a Christian point of view, is of a chapter on Immortality, in which Dr. Jacobs certainly believes although there is nowhere any sustained discussion of the subject. At several points there are illuminating comments treating directly of differences between the two religions, and of different attitudes towards those differences among Jews. That on pp. 123 ff. on Jewish and Christian *love of neighbour* is particularly useful.

I spoke at the beginning of the disappointment of a modernist at the limitations of orthodoxy, whether Jewish or Christian. This is particularly apparent in the treatment of the current issue of war and peace, of pacifism and nuclear armaments, about which Dr. Jacobs has found little to say beyond generalisations. But it comes also in the first chapter on the *Study of Torah*, and in the regretful realization that the author has no quotations with which to support his own very wise remarks about the need for 'a new type of Jewish scholar' who will blend traditional piety with modern objectivity and specialisation in the understanding of Judaism.

J. Parkes

LUKE THE TYPOLOGIST

The publishers describe this book[1] as an 'exciting demonstration' of typological exegesis at work on a Gospel. If he is not familiar with this variety of 'Biblical theology', the general reader (or the Sixth Former) may well find the book exciting, in that it reveals the strange results of a method of interpretation which demands symbolism at every turn—almost, indeed, in every word. But he may also feel bewildered, and perhaps repelled, by treatment which is completely at variance with all he has been told about how to approach and interpret other ancient documents, and which transforms 'the most beautiful book in the world' into a crossword puzzle

[1] *The Gospel according to St. Luke* (Torch Bible Commentary), edited by Canon W. R. F. Browning (S.C.M. Press, pp. 176; 12/6).

that can only be solved by those who have the minutiae of Old Testament theology at their finger-tips.

Thus, according to Canon Browning, Luke writes his Gospel to correspond to the first six books of the Old Testament. (Why not seven, one wonders—surely a more significant and likelier number?) His 'new Genesis' describes the birth and infancy of Jesus, his 'new Exodus' the temptation for forty days in the wilderness, his 'new Leviticus' the appointment of the Twelve, his 'new Numbers' the mission of the Seventy; and his 'new Deuteronomy' is the long section (ix, 51—xviii, 14), describing Jesus' journey to Jerusalem, in which the events are 'deliberately set out in an order to follow that of the Old Testament Deuteronomy'. Canon Browning's comment on x, i is, 'Here the detailed parallels with Deuteronomy begin. Jesus and the disciples travel from the Mount of Transfiguration to Jerusalem, as Israel in Deuteronomy, chapter I, journeys from Horeb to the borders of the Promised Land.' 'Luke's Book of Joshua (Hebrew form of Jesus),' says Canon Browning, 'is obviously (!) the Passion and Resurrection narratives.' (Exclamation mark mine.) Canon Browning accepts the Lucan authorship of the book, but does not explain why the companion of the apostle of the Gentiles should decide to cloak his message in an elaborately Jewish symbolism which would be unintelligible to almost all his readers.

It is a habit of 'Biblical Theology' to assume the historicity of the New Testament before interpretation begins. 'It is because of their connection with Jesus Christ that the books have authority' (Lambeth Report 1958, Bible section). Canon Browning writes from this standpoint. 'Luke is not likely to have made a mistake,' he says more than once; and on such a theme as miracle his attitude is exemplified by the words which he applies to the Resurrection, 'those who have not known Christ cannot believe'. Here is circular logic with a vengeance! We study the Bible to discover whether we can admit its claim to set forth the truth about God's revelation of himself in Jesus Christ—and are told that its authority lies in the fact that it makes this claim! Such reasoning seems more characteristic of fundamentalism (or of *Alice in Wonderland*) than of serious scholarship.

Those who do not share Canon Browning's Anglo-Catholicism will not be helped by such a note as this (on the words 'that something should be given her to eat', in the story of Jairus' daughter): 'This is the natural sequence to being raised by Christ. After Baptism the Eucharist'; or this, at the Last Supper: 'When he says that this is his last Passover until it is fulfilled in the Kingdom, he is referring to his future presence at the Church's Eucharists, when he is "remembered", i.e. brought back.' The uninstructed reader may well be mystified by this sentence from the note on the Transfiguration, 'The raiment may stand for the personal and particular integuments of the Incarnation'; though he may perhaps derive some amusement from the way in which Canon Browning discusses what he calls 'luminosity', in the same connection.

Such treatment of the New Testament is quite alien to the English tradition of Biblical scholarship, and can only widen the breach which already exists between the Churches and so many thinking people at the present time.

H. K. Luce

HOLY LIVING

At the conclusion of this attractive book[1] Stephen Neill suggests that one dominant characteristic of true Christian experience, both within and beyond the earthly pilgrimage, is that of astonished surprise. Certainly those who have known something of the author's own work over a good many years have not lacked on occasions for

[1] *Christian Holiness*, by Stephen Neill (Lutterworth Press; 15/-).

astonishment at his versatility, his command of languages, his ease in writing, his ability to deal with great themes in vivid and simple terms, his understanding of human experience in general and Christian experience in particular, his constant concern to relate the Christian past to the problems of our contemporary age.

Probably few in this country will have heard of the Carnahan Lectures. They are given at the invitation of the Evangelical Faculty of Theology in Buenos Aires, and for Stephen Neill it was all in the day's work, apparently, to deliver them in Spanish and repeat them in other parts of Latin America. I suspect that the general theme was suggested to him by the well-known existence of strong Pentecostal Churches in South America, and it would be hard to imagine a more sympathetic and balanced treatment of such subjects as holiness, perfectionism, and the marks of the Spirit, than these lectures provide.

One of the most attractive features of the book is the freshness with which the Biblical material is presented. There is no slavish dependence upon texts, but rather a lively reconstruction of the problems, so comparable to those of today, with which the writers were dealing. And in his attempt to pursue what might be called a *via media* between perfectionism and conformism, between Law and Liberty, between an *imitatio Christi* and salvation through the Spirit, between continuity and critical encounter, Bishop Neill never advocates any mere compromise or blurring of the issues. Each emphasis is fairly presented and the reader is left in no doubt that the Christian life involves vigilance and struggle right to the end, though he is equally assured of the magnitude of the resources of grace which can be his through the spirit.

The final message is intensely practical. After laying a firm Biblical and theological foundation, the author goes on to show clearly how Christian holiness is to be worked out in ethics and devotion. In churches overseas and at home study groups could well use the book as a guide to a deeper understanding of what the New Testament call to holiness implies, both in individual and corporate life.

F. W. Dillistone

ARE YOU SAVED?

Canon F. W. Bullock has given us a very valuable book in this study of Religious Conversion.[1] It is remarkable in several ways. The first is its plan and purpose. Dr. Bullock sets out to study the subject of conversion, partly by the biographical method and partly by reference to the literature on the subject. The first part of the book contains the conversion stories of thirty persons, from Thomas Halyburton in 1698, to Catherine Mumford, in 1845. Amongst the thirty are such well-known names as George Whitfield, Charles and John Wesley, John Newton, Henry Venn, Thomas Scott, Thomas Chalmers, and Robert Murray McCheyne, to mention but a few. The accounts are brief but the necessary details are given. The rest of the book is given to a discussion of various aspects of religious conversion in relation to the earlier biographical material and in the context of the literature on conversion.

Another remarkable feature of the book is its scope. Dr. Bullock chooses the area (Great Britain) and the period (1696–1845) deliberately, and recognises the limitations which such a choice imposes upon his work. But he rightly observes that this area and this period are particularly favourable for the study of religious conversion; and he takes his cases, different as they are from one another, as typical instances of evangelical conversion.

[1] *Evangelical Conversion in Great Britain, 1696-1845,* by F. W. B. Bullock. (Budd & Gillatt (St. Leonards-on-Sea), 287 pp.; 35/-.)

His treatment of the topic *as a subject* is broader than the title of the book might suggest. Canon Bullock is thoroughly familiar with all the major literature on the subject, and he is able to deal with it at various levels. He treats of the psychology of the conversion experience, dealing with pre-conversion preparation, the conversion crisis, post-conversion effects on character and religion, and with special features such as types of conversion, visions and dreams, the influence of sex, the age of conversion, conscious and unconscious elements in the conversion experience, and revivalism. He also deals with such subjects as the relation of the conversion experience to doctrinal belief, the validity of the conversion experience, and the value of the experience.

The book is extremely well documented and nicely printed, with detailed footnotes and an adequate index. The serious student will thank Dr. Bullock for his work. It is both scholarly and practical and brings together in one very readable volume all the main strands of study in this subject over the past half-century and more.

OWEN BRANDON

SHORT NOTICES

Steps to Christian Understanding, ed. R. J. W. Bevan (O.U.P., 15/-).

This collection of essays[1] by a distinguished group of authors is edited by the Reverend R. J. W. Bevan with the intention of stimulating discussion of some of the questions confronting both the thoughtful Christian and those who are interested in, though not actively associated with, the Christian community. The essays are systematically arranged in three main divisions: God and the World, God and Man, Doctrines of the Christian Faith. Each essay is a thoughtful presentation of the subject chosen. The book, edited by one who teaches in a Secondary Technical School, has a concern for young people growing up in this age of science and technology. The essays will be of considerable help to those responsible for teaching, but many of them would be beyond the understanding of pupils or students both in thought and language.

The choice of contributors ensures scholarly presentation, and there is in many essays clarity of expression and use of analogy which enhance the value of the book as a guide to teachers. This is especially true of the essays of Professor Butterfield on God in History and of Professor Hooke on the Biblical Story of Creation and Modern Science. The two longest essays in the volume, those on the Person of Christ and on the Christian Hope are, for different reasons, less satisfactory as contributions to a volume with the purpose as defined in the introduction. The first touches upon so many points in a rather formal way ('dry and academic' are the author's own words with reference to one topic), the second is most suggestive for the mature reader but is so often very involved both in language and analogy. On reading this and similar books, one often wonders whether a more living presentation of the life and teaching of Christ as an expression of his Person would not meet with a greater response from young people today. Was it necessary in this volume to devote over two pages to a dogmatic statement on the Virgin Birth with a verdict based upon what many would consider a tendentious argument?

One of the problems in religious teaching today is the recrudescence of fundamentalism and obscurantism. There is a trite phrase in one of the essays: 'Christian orthodoxy does no depend upon fundamentalist ideas about Holy Scripture', much of this volume will help the discerning teacher to present an enlightened orthodoxy.

W. G. BROWN

Faith for the Modern Man, by A. N. Gilkes (Faber, pp. 160, 12/6).

This is a lively book, with a healthy dash of liberalism about it. Mr. Gilkes, who is headmaster of Dulwich, writes with the chief aim of urging co-operation between Christianity and science. There is much truth in his criticisms of past and present mistakes of both Christians and scientists; liberals will particularly welcome his demand for a less rigid attitude on the part of Christians towards reunion and re-marriage after divorce, and also for simplification and restatement of doctrine.

When he writes positively, Mr. Gilkes becomes more orthodox, on such subjects as faith and the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. There are traces, too, of the 'God of the Gaps' idea as a way of reconciliation between science and Christian thought—though the main contention of Raven's Gifford Lectures, that 'nature and super-nature belong together', is quoted with approval. Mr. Gilkes has too much faith, for some of us, in the Lambeth Conference, Mr. C. S. Lewis, C.A.C.T.M., and extra-sensory perception. But his book has the root of the matter in it, and would make a good foundation for discussion with an intelligent Sixth Form.

NEWS OF THE MODERN CHURCHMEN'S UNION

Office Arrangements

Miss Holloway has told the Council that she is unable to continue her work as Assistant Secretary after the end of the year. From 1 January onwards the office of the Union will be at Caynham Vicarage, Ludlow. Members are asked to send all communications in the future to the Hon. Secretary at this address.

The Council at its meeting on 5 December expressed its great appreciation of the work which Miss Holloway has done in reorganising the Union's office. This will be echoed by all members who know of the work she has done.

Subscriptions

Members are reminded that the minimum subscription is now £1 and that it is hoped that, where possible, they will make an added contribution to further the work of the Union. Covenanted subscriptions are most helpful and details will be gladly sent to any members who would like to join in this scheme.

Conference 1961

The next Conference will be held at St. Hilda's College from 25 to 28 July. The Chairman is the Rev. W. G. Fallows, Principal of Ripon Hall, Oxford, and the subject is Christ and human needs.

Local Branches

The London Branch has held a meeting at which Dr. W. H. C. Frend gave a resumé on this year's Conference. A Study Group on the Gospel according to St. John and a discussion group have also been planned.

The Arnside (Lancashire) Branch has also had a successful meeting, with 34 members present at which the Rev. H. C. Snape spoke about the Early Days of the Church at Rome.

The Hon. Secretary would be glad to hear from members in other parts of the country who are interested in forming a local branch.